

CHARLES SEIGNOBOS

PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

THE
RISE OF EUROPEAN
CIVILIZATION



Translated from the French by Catherine Alison Phillips

NEW YORK · ALFRED · A · KNOPF · MCMXXXVIII



FIRST AMERICAN EDITION

Copyright 1938 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

*All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced
in any form without permission in writing from the publisher,
except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review
to be printed in a magazine or newspaper.*

Manufactured in the United States of America

INTRODUCTION

In presenting to the reader this book in which I have attempted to combine the comparative history of all the peoples of Europe from the earliest times to the present day, I feel called upon to explain what decided me to undertake so bold an enterprise and what my intention has been.

Sixty years spent in studying and teaching the history of all countries have given me opportunities of comparing the peoples of Europe at every stage of their history. Comparison has enabled me to notice the common features in their life, which are not apparent to historians confined to the study of a single country or period.

In comparing the vicissitudes of the different peoples and their conditions of life, I have succeeded in disentangling a few general features of resemblance from the enormous mass of knowledge accumulated by specialists during more than a century and in discovering how these arose. I recognized two kinds, one the result of similar but independent conditions, the other acquired by imitating the same model, as created by a single people.

I have been careful to bring within the scope of this comparison the various types of living-conditions which have formed the subject of special histories, so as to embrace the whole range of a people's different activities: its means of existence, economic labour, customs, law, political system, religion, sciences, literature, and arts.

My object has been to explain the way in which they became transformed by distinguishing between changes resulting from that conjuncture of independent events which is known as chance or accident — I mean such things as wars, invasions, revolutions, and reforms — and those arising out of previous conditions, such as the rise of some power or the spread of a religion or institution.

I have not contented myself with recording results. I have tried to make actions intelligible by indicating their causes — passions, desires, beliefs, knowledge, or rules of conduct.

Introduction

It has not been my intention to confine my study to the small minority of privileged persons (sometimes adorned with the title of "the *élite*") whose actions occupy most space in records and historical works. I have sought to describe the conditions of life among the mass of the people in so far as they are known to us, though our knowledge is unfortunately very inadequate. I did not intend to describe conventional forms and official institutions, but have taken pains to describe the real practices of political, religious, social, and economic life.

I have given the chief place to political events and systems, to wars, revolutions, and the acts of governments. The last war sufficed to prove with what force politics extends its action over the whole life of a people.

Thanks to recent works on economic history, I have been able to give considerable space to agricultural and industrial production, trade, credit, and technical progress, and often even to point out the origin of innovations and explain in what circumstances they arose.

I have treated the mass of facts referred to under the term *social* by combining in the same exposition the structure of society and its division into classes with the conditions of material life, usages, social relations, and the law relating to the family and property.

Under the term *intellectual life* I have included chiefly those mental processes which determine the conduct of peoples, religious beliefs and moral conceptions resulting from education, and, in recent times, political formulas and scientific knowledge. I have not ventured to omit all mention of literature and the arts, though they have so small a place in the lives of the enormous majority of peoples; but have confined myself to indicating their general character and principal types. I regret that I have not been able to give more space to the usages of daily life — meals, clothing, dwellings, furniture, the apportionment of time, family life, social relations, and amusements, which have always been the main interest in life of all peoples.

I have divided the sequence of time into periods, most of which have each a corresponding chapter. I have made these of very unequal length, growing shorter as, on approaching the present, society became more complicated, activity more varied, and the facts, too, better known. I have deliberately renounced all that ordinarily constitutes the attraction of history: the dramatic element of personal

Introduction

adventure and the picturesque element of detailed description. This book is intended for readers capable of taking an interest in the real character and sequence of historical facts.

In comparing general conditions I have had to employ general terms — such as *leader, lieutenant, delegate, warrior, priest, government, army, war, religion, system of government* — which sometimes give my narrative an abstract appearance. I have endeavoured to make it easy to read by using simple, homely language consisting of words intelligible to all. I have avoided the conventional forms of rhetorical style, pseudo-scientific terms, and, above all, metaphors, which transform abstract formulas into real persons. I have taken care to connect actions and ideas with real people by explaining them through motives or feelings.

It has not been my wish to write a work of reference, to be consulted for obtaining information upon precise historical points. I am concerned only with a general picture of the past of Europe, which is intended to be read consecutively and to make its impression as a whole.

I have not felt it possible to give a bibliography. If it were complete, it would have to be almost as long as the book. I need only say that I have made use of the Gotha and Oncken series in German; of the great national histories of the type of the *Histoire de France* edited by Lavissee, or the *Political History of England*; and of the French collections of universal history. I owe much to the works of Kroeber, Dottin, Niederle, F. Lot, Delbrück, Hoetzsch, and, for economic history, H. Sée, Kulischer, Birnitz, Harris, and, above all, Sombart, Lipson, and Heckscher.

I have made it my rule to set forth only such results of historical work as are established by the consensus of specialists; and in recording facts which to me seem certain, but on which there is not complete agreement, I have used expressions suggestive of doubt. I am sure, however, that errors of detail could be pointed out, committed either by me or by some historian whom I have been wrong in following. I do not think they are sufficient to affect the value of my views as a whole and my general conclusions; and I hope I have succeeded in giving a correct picture of the events and transformations through which the peoples of Europe have passed in arriving at their present state.

CONTENTS

I · The Land and Population	3
II · Greek Civilization and Roman Domination	26
III · Transformation of the Empire and Introduction of Christianity	45
IV · The Establishment of the Barbarians in the Empire and the Spread of Christianity	62
V · Restoration of Unity by the Empire and the Church	84
VI · Origins of the Feudal System and Formation of the Nations (Ninth to Eleventh Centuries)	101
VII · Beginning of the Middle Ages Proper (Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries)	127
VIII · Foundation of the Towns (Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries)	147
IX · Changes Affecting the Clergy and Religion	164
X · End of the Middle Ages (Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries)	177
XI · The Beginning of Modern Times	212
XII · Political Life from the Fifteenth Century to the Middle of the Seventeenth	230
XIII · Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Middle of the Seventeenth	246
XIV · The Second Half of the Seventeenth Century	264
XV · The Eighteenth Century	287
XVI · The French Revolution and the War of Invasions	307
XVII · The First Part of the Nineteenth Century	327

Contents

XVIII · Revolutions and Reforms	349
XIX · The Long Peace and Changed Conditions of Life	370
XX · The Great War and Its Sequel	399
Conclusion	423
Index	<i>follows page</i> 436

THE RISE
OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

C H A P T E R O N E

THE LAND AND POPULATION

●

The name Europe, originated by the Greeks, has changed its significance with each succeeding age. It was first applied to the south-eastern region adjoining Asia, next extended to the lands on the northern shore of the Mediterranean, then to those bordering on the Atlantic, and lastly to those of the centre and east as they gradually came in touch with the Mediterranean world. It was a geographical term, implying no idea of any community between the inhabitants. It is only in modern times that a comparison of the European population with that of the other continents has led to the recognition of a common stock of feelings and customs proper to the European peoples, and given them a consciousness of solidarity, which is, however, somewhat vague.

Geographical conditions

Europe, in the modern sense of the word, is the smallest of the continents, its area, some 3,862,000 square miles, amounting to only seven per cent of the total land area. It is attached to Asia by a very broad isthmus, some 2,700 miles across, and separated from Africa by an inland sea dotted with islands, which make it easy for even small boats to cross it. It is separated from America by a very broad ocean, which only ships can negotiate.

The distribution of high and low land in Europe is very unequal. It is sharply ridged in the south, towards the Mediterranean, where rise the mighty mountain masses of the Pyrenees, Alps and Apennines, whose steep slopes leave room only for narrow valleys or small plains. Thus the land is divided up into small compartments separated by mountain barriers. The western, Atlantic (or Oceanic) region has a

far less broken surface, scattered with very much worn-down mountain masses, which rise in gentler slopes to a greater altitude, and is formed mainly of plateaux and gently sloping plains. The centre and east (forming the greater part of Europe) consist mainly of vast plains, the surface being not very broken except for the Harz Mountains, the mass of the Carpathians, and the Scandinavian Peninsula in the far north.

The distance to which the sea penetrates inland varies very greatly. In the most mountainous part, the south, the Mediterranean runs up a very long way, in gulfs that cut the mass into peninsulas, and is dotted with a very large number of islands, mostly very small, the coasts being indented by numerous bays, forming natural harbours. On the Atlantic side the sea does not penetrate so far inland, the coast is lower and far less indented, but the tide runs up the river estuaries to very well-sheltered inland harbours. On the north-west the Atlantic surrounds the two largest islands in Europe, Great Britain and Ireland. Only a small part of the centre and east borders on seas, only one of which is open (the North Sea), the other two (the Baltic and the Black Sea) being almost landlocked. Except in Norway the shores are low-lying and harbours infrequent.

The climate is far more uniform than that of the other continents. The average temperature varies between 64.4° F. above and 15.8° F. below freezing-point. But there are none the less very great differences between the various parts. The Mediterranean region has a hot, dry climate, with infrequent and torrential rains. The Atlantic region has the most equable climate, slight variations of temperature, and frequent and regular rains, thanks to the warm current coming from America (the Gulf Stream) and the prevailing winds blowing from the ocean. In the rest of Europe the climate is far more extreme, with great differences of temperature between one season and another, prolonged periods of drought in summer and very hard frosts in winter.

As a result of the ridged surface and the climate, the watercourses in the Mediterranean region are almost all short and torrential in certain seasons, which renders them unfit for navigation, those which are navigable emptying themselves into a tideless sea by way of a delta, which bars the entrance to ships. In the Atlantic region the rivers have a more regular flow, ending in estuaries that form good

harbours facing towards America. In the eastern region the rivers are broad and have a regular flow, but empty themselves into inland seas.

These conditions determine the nature of the soil and subsoil. In the Mediterranean region the land-surface formed by recent upheavals, on which rain-erosion produces only a slight effect, contains few areas with a deep alluvial soil; it is covered by only a shallow layer of vegetable mould and is badly watered. The underlying strata are poor in deposits of metal and contain no coal. In the Atlantic region, where the soil on the plains is formed of alluvial deposits, the ground is covered with a fairly thick layer of vegetable mould. The underlying strata contain large quantities of ores, especially iron ore, and extensive deposits of coal, especially in England, the Netherlands, and Germany. In the eastern region, the far north, once covered by glaciers, has a soil formed of little more than infertile gravel and sand. The greater part of this region consists of vast plains, formerly covered with grasslands which, on decaying, have left a thick layer of very fertile humus. The lower strata at the foot of the mountain masses (Carpathians and Caucasus) contain ores, deposits of coal, and stores of oil.

Effect of physical conditions on the life of peoples

These conditions have produced different reactions upon the life of the peoples at different periods; the effect of environment has differed according as men endured it passively or behaved in such a way as to escape it: there have been lands with excellent harbours that for a long time had no sailors, and the coal deposits all over Europe were not worked by a single miner before modern times. The life of a people varies according to the extent to which men have managed to take advantage of material conditions. It has differed between one region of Europe and another and varied according to the period.

The Mediterranean combined the conditions favourable to not yet very civilized peoples, provided with poor means of production, communication, and defence. The essential requirement for life — that is, warmth, procured by food, clothing, and housing — was easier to satisfy in a warm, dry climate, which reduced the necessity for clothing and housing and enabled men to live on little food. The population could be content with a meagre soil having a small yield; its oc-

Effect of physical conditions on the life of peoples

cupations, employing as yet only man- and animal-power, could dispense with subjacent strata rich in fuel. The land, having a very broken surface, was split up into a large number of small compartments protected against invasion by strong barriers. The sea, being easy to cross, kept the land in constant communication with Egypt and Asia. The inhabitants, possessing as yet no mechanical skill in their crafts, were able to take as their teachers the Oriental peoples with a more ancient civilization. Thus the antique world grew up on the shores of the Mediterranean, composed of small, independent, war-like peoples, living on an easily exhausted soil, very poor in forage, yielding a harvest only every other year, and producing food for poor beasts only, particularly sheep and goats, small oxen, and cows giving little milk. Crafts, using only manual labour, produced but slowly; trade was hardly carried on except by sea, along the coasts. This civilization, demanding a very great manual effort for a poor amount of production, remained simple, poor in material resources, and confined to a small number of privileged persons. Its effect upon the life of Europe was chiefly due to the work of the intelligence and the production of works of art.

The Atlantic region did not lend itself well to this mode of life. The colder, damper climate required greater resources and more work to support existence. Communication by sea was more difficult and could not range as far as America. None of the lands facing the Atlantic participated in the civilization of antiquity. But conditions grew more favourable as the progress of mechanical skill enabled men to turn the natural advantages of the land to greater advantage. The earth, deeper and more fertile, yielded a better crop on being subjected to deeper ploughing. In two years out of three the land, being better watered, made it possible to feed better cattle, milch cows, oxen raised for beef, and pigs. Industry profited by the fuller streams to use the water-mill for various purposes. Richer deposits of ores increased the production of iron by means of charcoal made from wood provided by the forests. Trade found in the regular flow of the rivers a means of penetrating inland. The Mediterranean and the North Sea provided trade-routes to foreign lands; from the end of the fifteenth century onwards the Atlantic opened up the way to America, Africa, and the Far East. In the nineteenth century the working of coal and iron mines on a large scale provided a means of increasing

The most ancient populations of Europe

supplies of the products of industry and steamship transport to such a point as to revolutionize the conditions of life.

The Continental region was kept in a backward state by conditions very unfavourable to not very civilized peoples — a very hard climate, impenetrable forests and vast marshes along the course of the rivers, plains lying open to invasion by mounted peoples, who ravaged the lands without founding any lasting nation, and the difficulty of communication with the civilized world. For a long time the greater part of this immense area remained almost unpopulated and only filled up slowly before the seventeenth century. The regions of the west and south were settled by foreigners from civilized Europe, artisans, merchants, or farmers who formed islands incapable of absorption by the indigenous population, especially in the towns. This delayed the creation of compact national units, especially in the Danubian region, while the south-eastern peninsula, the earliest to be civilized, became under Turkish domination the most barbarous land in Europe.

The most ancient populations of Europe

History can tell us nothing about the most ancient inhabitants of Europe, for it deals as a rule with written records, and Europe was already populated at the time when writing began; it is for this reason that the ages before writing have been called *prehistoric*. All we know about these times we owe to three processes of acquiring knowledge, organized in three special sciences: anthropology, ethnography, and linguistics, which operate either by direct study of the remains of every kind left behind by past populations or by observing those of the present and tracing them back to the past by means of reasoning.

Anthropology observes all the characters of the human body in the men of the present day and, by comparing the dimensions and proportions of the parts, the shape of the skull, the colour of the skin, eyes, and hair (and now even the composition of the blood), sets to work to classify men in *races* or *types*. When applied to prehistoric times it can work only upon skeletons, but it attempts to conjecture to what race the ancient population of each country belonged, on the assumption that the present inhabitants are descendants of the ancient ones and have preserved the same type.

Ethnography studies men's customs and habitual actions and the

What anthropology tells us about races

objects which they use, and its work is to classify them into *peoples* (that is, groups each practising the same customs). Applied to pre-history, it works upon the objects made or used by the ancient peoples: tombs, weapons, tools, ornaments, plant or animal remains, and the fragments of pottery found on the sites of former dwellings.

Linguistics studies the languages spoken today or preserved in written documents and tries to go back to the past forms of the language in such a way as to classify the peoples according to the resemblances between their *languages*. It collects the names of streams, mountains, villages, in order to go back to the language formerly spoken in the country.

The knowledge acquired by means of anthropology, ethnography, and linguistics does not supply the means of reconstituting the history of prehistoric peoples, but enables us at least to distinguish a few features in the life of the European populations and grasp the main lines of their evolution.

What anthropology tells us about races

All the peoples of Europe belong to the white race which also peoples western Asia and northern Africa. Anthropologists are agreed, in the main, in distinguishing three main groups in Europe, known as *races* (not counting two or three sub-varieties), each characterized by certain features which make up the ideal racial type. They are distributed in three zones, according to latitude. The southernmost, which occupies both shores of the Mediterranean, those of northern Africa and southern Europe, is the domain of what is known as the *Mediterranean* race, which is short, with a long skull (dolichocephalic) and delicate extremities, very dark skin, and black eyes and hair. The central zone, which extends across the Continent in the mountain region and as far as the Atlantic in France and Great Britain, is peopled by what is known as the *Alpine* race, of medium stature, stocky, with a short skull (brachycephalic), brown hair and eyes, long beards, and wavy hair. The north of Europe, from Russia to eastern England, is inhabited by the race known as Nordic (or European, because it is found only in Europe), a race of tall stature, powerfully built, with large extremities, having a fair skin and red-gold (*blond*)¹

¹ The "red" or auburn colour of hair and beard is not a variant of the golden (*blond*). It is classified among the shades of brown and is usually found in company with a white, fine-grained skin sprinkled with freckles.

The periods of civilization as established by ethnography

eyes and hair. These characters are not found in any other population in the world. The conclusion is that they were formed by prolonged isolation in a country with only a faint light (perhaps Scandinavia).

It must never be forgotten that pure racial types are an ideal figment of anthropology. Very few individuals are to be found in real life who combine all the characters of the same type; almost all men simultaneously exhibit features belonging to several different types (for example, light-coloured eyes with black hair), and members of the same family, father, son, or brother, hardly ever possess the same racial characters. This proves that Europeans are not "racially" pure; their type is the product of a cross between parents of different race. This amounts to saying that they are half-breeds (*métis*) and even in antiquity the study of prehistoric skeletons shows people of different types lying together in the same tomb. Thus anthropology provides information of only controversial importance. Since excavation has been practised methodically, clearing away each layer of remains until the original soil has been reached, prehistoric ethnography has provided surer and more varied knowledge.

The periods of civilization as established by ethnography

Ethnography deals with the millions of objects found *in situ* at different levels and coming from populations which have succeeded one another on the same spot. This enables us to distinguish successive modes of life and classify them according to the degree of perfection, the mechanical skill applied to the production of the objects. During the nineteenth century classification was based upon the material used for making implements, and the prehistoric ages were divided into four periods of unequal duration. This rudimentary classification has been corrected and completed by the methodical study of tombs, the arrangement of the dead body, and, above all, the remains of pottery, whose shape and ornamentation differ in the successive layers of remains. This has made it possible to determine roughly over what area of land each mode of life was practised. But it has been noted that a people often adopts foreign usages and that the same custom is followed by many different peoples. The successive modes of all recognized on the same site indicate not populations of different race, but merely successive states of civilization.

The periods of civilization as established by ethnography

The most ancient layers of earth contain the remains of the period of chipped stone (*palæolithic*), the duration of which was by far the longest, having been variously calculated at figures ranging as high as four hundred thousand years. It extends back to one of the glacial periods and has been subdivided into some ten periods, known by names derived from sites on which excavation has taken place. The feature common to the whole period is that the inhabitants of Europe used none but natural raw materials — chipped stone, bones, sinews, skins of animals — possessed no domestic animals, and lived by hunting and fishing. They knew some wild animals of varieties that are extinct or have vanished from Europe — the mammoth, bison, reindeer — of which they have left very accurate painted or carved representations. They lived in a savage state and could form only a very scanty population. Their bones, which are, moreover, very scarce, do not indicate that they belonged to a white race.

The period of polished stone (*neolithic*) begins with peoples leading a life of a profoundly different type, and, up to the present, no certain link has been discovered between them and the savages of the palæolithic age, whereas from the neolithic age onwards the mode of life underwent a continuous and gradual transformation. The most abundant information about this period has been furnished by the objects found in very large numbers in the villages known as “lake settlements,” built on piles on the shores of certain lakes in Switzerland, and by the large villages enclosed within walls and built on mounds, known as *terramare* in northern Italy. These have been supplemented by similar objects found in “the tombs” of Europe and the excavations that have taken place in Asia at Susa, Troy, and Anau, where the most ancient deposits go back to forty or fifty centuries before Christ.

These peoples did not live like savages. They had permanent dwellings grouped in villages, those on the Swiss lakes being built on a platform supported by tree-trunks hewn to a point and driven very deep into the lake, those in Italy being surrounded by a wall. The dwelling-houses must have been round huts with pointed roofs, made of branches joined together at the top. They already possessed our domestic animals — the dog, the goat, the sheep, the cow, the pig — cultivated our cereals — barley, rye, oats, millet, and even wheat — made flour by pounding the grain in mortars, spun wool and linen,

The periods of civilization as established by ethnography

wove stuffs, made ropes and nets, and produced clay pottery. It was, therefore, a settled population, living on its crops and cattle. Its plants and animals were not found in Europe before the age of polished stone, and since these certainly existed in western Asia it is probable that they arrived in Europe together with the population, which itself came from Asia. It is supposed to have come by way of the Danube valley and the Alps.

The most ancient deposits contain as yet only implements and weapons of polished stone; the chief of these is the axe, which served for both chopping wood and fighting. A few metal objects gradually appear in the more recent layers, first gold, used for ornaments, then copper (these being the metals easiest to extract and work), and afterwards bronze, made of copper with an alloy of tin. It is this metal which for a very long period, perhaps twenty centuries, provided the material for implements, weapons (axe, sword, dagger, lance-head, and arrow), and ornaments (necklaces, bracelets, rings, clasps). It was during this period that the constructions known as *megalithic* were erected. These included: in Greece, the encircling walls, made of great blocks of rough stone, called by the Greeks *Cyclopean* (at Mycenæ and Tiryns); in England, the enormous monument of Stonehenge; in France, the blocks of stone set up on end, called by the Breton name of *menhirs*, and the tombs of rough stone covered with earth called in Breton *dolmens*, formed of a narrow passage ending in a chamber in which the dead bodies were laid out with their weapons, ornaments, and pottery, in such a way as to receive the food brought to the dead. *Dolmens* are found over a very great area, from Syria along the north of Africa to Spain, France, Great Britain, and as far off as Sweden. Thus the custom seems to have been adopted by several different peoples; it went on for a very long time, from the age of polished stone down to the end of the Bronze Age. Neither the date nor the duration of the Bronze Age in Europe is precisely known to us.

From these well-established facts we may draw conclusions about two important features in the life of these peoples: The great aggregate of labour forthcoming to construct the tombs, and the great value of the gold ornaments and weapons buried, prove that they believed it necessary to make great sacrifices on behalf of the dead. The great expenditure of force on the extraction and transport of the enormous blocks forming their monuments and on cutting and driving thousands

The origin of the languages of Europe

of piles required the efforts of a great number of men working together under the direction of a single head, which implies chiefs capable of making themselves obeyed.

The discoveries made in Crete and Greece show that, long before the end of the Bronze Age, between the twentieth and the fifteenth century before our era, the islands and coasts of the Archipelago owed obedience to kings powerful enough to have great palaces, magnificent tombs, and strong walls constructed. The memory of these is preserved in the legend of Minos, King of Crete, and Agamemnon, King of Mycenæ.

Till toward the fifteenth century even the most civilized peoples in Egypt and Chaldea had only known how to use the metals that were easy to work: gold, copper, silver, tin, lead. Iron, which is more difficult to extract, does not appear till the most recent period, being used first as an ornament and afterwards for weapons. In Europe, towards the tenth century, these took the form of the iron sword, first short, then long. Towards the same time there appears a new form of tomb, the *tumulus*, a circular mound of earth in which the warrior is buried with his weapons, sometimes with his servants or wife. These tombs are found from the south of Russia (where they are called *kurgans*) across Europe, as far as the north and east of France and England. The most ancient of them have been discovered in Austria, which suggests that the custom comes from the east of Europe. The iron sword was the weapon of a people known to us from records, and called by the Greeks *Keltai* and the Romans *Galli*.

The origin of the languages of Europe

Linguistics, by comparing the words and forms of the different languages, has established that almost all the languages spoken in Europe are derived from a common language, now lost, from which also came the ancient languages of Iran (*Zend*) and India (*Sanskrit*). The Iranians and Hindus had even preserved the memory of the migration which brought them into Asia at a time when they were united under the name of Aryans, which ought not to be applied to the peoples of Europe. By comparing the words which have remained the same in all languages, linguists have tried to locate the centre where the mother language was formed, and have concluded that it must be sought not in Asia, as was long believed, but in a part of north-eastern

The origin of the languages of Europe

Europe where grow the oak, beech, and birch. They have distinguished the order in which the different groups of peoples speaking a language derived from this mother tongue split off: first the Aryans, who migrated to Asia; then the group known as "eastern," consisting of the Slav, Baltic (Lithuanian), Albanian, and Armenian languages; then the western group, consisting of the Germanic languages (Scandinavian, German, Anglo-Saxon); later the Hellenic languages; and, last of all, the Italic languages (Oscan, Latin) and the Celtic languages (Gallic, Gaelic, Brythonic).

Thus the peoples of Europe speak languages of the same origin, which are grouped under the name "Indo-European." But we should not conclude from this that they belonged to the same race; for language is not inherited by birth, but acquired by education. There are abundant examples of peoples who have changed their language and speak a different one from that of their ancestors. A language has frequently been brought to the indigenous population by a foreign minority; France and the Romance lands speak a language of Roman origin, though only an infinitesimal number of Romans came there. All we are justified in saying is that the use of these languages of common origin was introduced into the different parts of Europe by groups of men speaking them who migrated in different directions.

We must be on our guard against a confusion of terms which has been introduced into the language because the original classification of the peoples of Europe was made, before anthropology had come into being, by German philologists who classified peoples according to their language but gave the name "race" to each group speaking the same language. We have grown accustomed to speaking of the Celtic, Germanic, or Slav races, and even of the Latin race, etc. In the censuses taken in central and eastern Europe persons have been classified as belonging to this or that race (in German, *Stamm*) according to their language. One might just as well speak, say the specialists in linguistics, of a fair or dark conjugation or a brachycephalic declension. There is no correlation between language and race in Europe. The proof of this is that races and languages are distributed over the Continent on two different systems, the races (Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean) according to latitude, in zones ranging from north to south, while the languages (Celtic, Germanic, Slav) range from west to east, according to longitude.

Formation and migration of peoples

At the two opposite extremities of Europe populations survive speaking languages which differ greatly from Indo-European: in the south-east, in Spain, the Basques; in the north-east, the inhabitants of the shores of the Baltic, whose language, *Finnish*, is still spoken in Finland and Estonia.

Formation and migration of peoples

The populations of the ages of polished stone and bronze are known to us only from material remains. We do not know either what language they spoke or even by what name they called themselves. The written records in which names of peoples appear are the work of the Greeks and Romans and are principally concerned with wars. They come from foreigners who knew these peoples mainly as enemies, and give us very little information about their mode of life. Hence the origin and adventures of almost all the peoples of Europe are totally unknown to us. We only know that the population was formed by two different processes.

The peopling of a land took place normally as the result of the excess of births over deaths during a period of from twenty to thirty centuries. A few families had only to settle in a still unpopulated territory for their descendants ultimately to form a people speaking the same language and practising the same customs. The example of the French colonists in Canada and the Dutch Boers at the Cape shows that a population in an unsettled country can double its numbers in less than half a century.

Several peoples, again, were formed by a different process. We only know the most recent cases, the memory of which was preserved by tradition, as related by the writers of antiquity. It might happen that a people left one country and went to settle another, subjugating the former inhabitants by force. In Greece the Dorians, coming down from the mountains of the north about the twelfth century B.C., had occupied almost the whole of the Peloponnese and Crete, destroying the civilization of the Bronze Age. Two invasions coming from the north later had established the Thessalians in the north and the Boeotians in the centre of Greece. A people coming from Asia Minor by an unknown route had occupied part of Italy and been driven back into Tuscany, where it had built towns surrounded by strong ramparts.

It is known to us under the name of *Etruscans*, given to it by its neighbours the Romans.

The most important migrations were those of the warlike peoples armed with the iron sword, whom we call the Gauls. They spoke a Celtic language and had spread in different directions.

Peoples speaking a Celtic language established themselves in the great islands of the north-west in two migrations separated by a long interval. Towards the ninth century B.C., the first of these occupied Ireland and the north of Great Britain, where its language was the origin of the *Gaelic* spoken in Ireland and Scotland. The second, towards the fifth century, was that of the *Britanni*, who left their name to Great Britain; their language was the origin of the *Celtic* dialects of England, Cornish, Welsh, and the Gallic and Breton of France. Later, towards the fifth century, invasions from France went south-westwards, where the Celts, mingling with the Iberians, formed the warlike people of the Celtiberians in the east of Spain; eastwards, to southern Germany and as far away as Hungary and Serbia, where place-names in a Celtic language have survived; south-eastwards, where the Gauls occupied the region of the Po and Apennines and pushed their incursions as far as Rome. In the third century the Gauls crossed the Danubian regions and went as far as Greece and Asia Minor, where the kingdom of the Galatians was created. The last migration was that of the *Belgæ*, who occupied the north-east of France. The domination of the Celts then extended from end to end of Europe, from the lower Danube as far as Spain and Ireland, leaving traces behind it in the shape of the round tombs of their chiefs and Celtic place-names. It was gradually driven back by the migrations of other warlike peoples.

The records of antiquity, though very scarce, enable us to make out how the different peoples were distributed over the area of Europe. The name applied to each people by the ancients was often not that by which the people called itself; but the name given to it by the ancients is that which we use to designate it.

The peoples of southern Europe. At the south-eastern extremity, close to Asia, nowadays known as the Balkan peninsula, the southern part of it and the islands of the Archipelago were inhabited by the peoples most advanced in civilization, included under the common

name of *Hellenes*; the Romans called them *Greeks*. They had sent colonies to every shore of the Mediterranean from the Crimea and Asia Minor as far as Spain.

The north of the peninsula, as far as the Danube, belonged to the Thracians, who had remained more barbarous and whose language has disappeared. The mountain mass adjacent to the Adriatic, and very difficult of access, was inhabited by the Illyrians; their descendants seem to be the Albanians, who have preserved a very ancient language. On the borders of Italy, towards the mouths of the Po, had settled a people whose origin is a matter of controversy: the Veneti, who have left their name to Venice.

The Italic peninsula had had very ancient populations whose language is lost and who left their name to two islands, the *Sardi* to Sardinia and the *Sicani*, later the *Siculi*, to Sicily. The southern tip of Italy, where peoples unknown to us had existed, was occupied, like Sicily, by Greek colonies. The whole of the mountainous region in the centre belonged to warlike populations speaking Italiote dialects: in the south the *Samnites*, who had poured down into the plain of Naples, in the centre a number of small peoples (*Oscans*, *Umbrians*, and towards the sea, on the Tiber, the *Latins*). The land known nowadays as Tuscany had been conquered by the Etruscans, who had come from afar, and whose language, known to us by inscriptions in Greek characters, has remained incomprehensible, but does not seem to have been Indo-European. They knew how to construct stone vaulting, and their soothsayers predicted the future by examining the liver of sacrificial victims. These two arts were practised in Asia Minor, which, according to their traditions, was their country of origin.

The Continental region to the north of the Apennines — which the ancients did not regard as forming part of Italy — was occupied after the Etruscans by Gaulish peoples who had advanced as far as the Adriatic and even taken Rome.

The south-western peninsula, already called Spain, was the land of the Iberians, short, dark, with curly hair, and fighting with light arms. Their language, of which we know only a few words, does not seem to have been Indo-European. They were split up into a large number of very small peoples and had already overflowed beyond the Pyrenees, penetrating as far as the Garonne, where they formed a people known as the *Aquitanians*, whose name was afterwards ex-

tended as far as the Loire. It is possible that before the coming of the Celts, during the Bronze Age, Great Britain had a population of the same kind, called the *Silurians*.

The peoples of western Europe. On the shores of the Mediterranean, from the Gulf of Genoa to the Rhône, lived some small peoples known collectively by the name of *Ligurians*, who seem, before the coming of the Gauls, to have spread as far as the Pyrenees. Their language, of which we know only a few words, was possibly Indo-European.

All the rest of France remained the domain of the *Gauls*, a warlike people speaking a Celtic language, in touch with the Greek colonies on the coast (the chief of which was Marseilles), which had taught them the Greek alphabet and the use of money. The latest arrivals, the *Belgæ*, who had remained more warlike, occupied the country to the north of the Seine.

Great Britain and Ireland also belonged to warlike peoples speaking a Celtic language and in touch with the Celts on the Continent. They had very much the same customs and received instruction in a common religious doctrine given by the *Druids*, who were organized in a powerful body.

The peoples of central Europe. East of the Rhine and north of the Danube the vast area of central Europe as far as the Vistula and the Scandinavian Peninsula had only a very sparse population formed of peoples speaking a Germanic language, and not much attached to the soil. They did not cultivate it much, had no towns, and readily moved to great distances westwards or southwards with their families and flocks, in search of a warmer climate and richer lands. The Romans have taught us to call them *Germans*, a name which they did not give themselves. Those who afterwards played an active part in the barbarian invasions, and later in the formation of the modern states, came from the north: the *Goths*, *Vandals*, and *Burgundians*, coming from Sweden; the *Suevi*, *Langobardi*, and *Angles*, coming from the shores of the North Sea. They impressed the Greeks and Romans by their tall stature, their vigour, their blue eyes, fair hair, white skin, and taste for intoxicating liquors. It seems that there was a high proportion of men of Nordic race among them. The Gauls produced the same impression upon the ancients; indeed, the *Belgæ* seemed to them to differ very little from the Germans, but it is not

certain that these belonged to the same race. The skulls in their tombs are not of a definitely Nordic type, and the Latin or Greek words used of the colour of their hair apply to red hair rather than blond.

The peoples of eastern Europe. Beyond the Danube the vast plain running up to the far end of the Black Sea was traversed by nomad peoples living in covered wagons. Those in the west, known to the ancients as *Sarmatians*, spoke an Indo-European language related to that of Persia. Those in the east, known to the Greeks as *Scythians*, extended very far northwards, some of them having settled down to till the soil. They grew wheat, which they sold to the Greeks. The land is scattered with great tumulus-shaped tombs of unknown origin, in which have been found the products of an indigenous art influenced by Greek art. The mountainous region in the north-west, known nowadays as Transylvania, was dominated in the second century by a warlike people, the *Dacians*, who had taken the place of the conquerors speaking a Celtic language; their language died out under Roman rule.

To the east of the Germans and Scandinavians, on the shores of the Baltic and on the vast plains of Russia, then still covered with marshes and forests, were scattered very sparse and not very civilized populations of which the ancients knew little beyond their names. It appeared later that most of them spoke one of the Slav languages of the Indo-European family.

Two peoples on the shores of the Baltic, the *Borussians* in the west and the *Lithuanians* in the east, had each its own language, which had remained very archaic and closer to the Indo-European mother tongue. In their racial characteristics and customs they approximated to the Scandinavians more than to the Slavs. The most distant people, the Finns, akin to peoples of the yellow race, spoke a Ural-Altaic language foreign to Europe and still led an almost savage life. Contact with the Slav immigrants and crossing with them afterwards gave them a greater resemblance to Europeans.

Relations between people and race

We must be careful to note that the name given to a people has no relation to the race of the majority of it; it is only the name of the minority ruling a land in which the mass of the inhabitants was of another kind: a people of tillers of the soil subjugated by foreign

warriors often took the name of the conquering minority forming a privileged class, and began to speak its language. The difference was, indeed, recognized in lands where the memory of a conquest was preserved — in Greece among the *Dorians* of Sparta, who made the peasant Helots work, and among the aristocracy of the Thessalian horsemen. Among the Gauls Cæsar distinguished between an aristocracy of “knights” (*equites*) owning large estates and a peasant “*plebs*” treated almost like slaves. The vast territory in which Celtic languages were spoken included France, Great Britain, and northern Italy and was governed by Celtic warriors. Now, the Celts are described by ancient writers as having the same characters as the Germans: as being men of tall stature, broadly built, great eaters and drinkers, and furious fighters. This picture does not tally with either the physical type or the character of the present population in the centre and west of France or the Celtic parts of Great Britain. So the Celts may have been merely the warrior class, while the mass of the peasants was descended from the former inhabitants.

The populations of the Bronze Age, and even of the age of polished stone, whose names we do not know, tilled the soil and owned cattle, and were consequently tied to the land by the necessity of waiting for the harvest and feeding their beasts in winter. Being always in the same place and enclosed within a very narrow horizon, they could form only small groups, incapable of combining in very numerous communities under the authority of a single chief. On the other hand the peoples living chiefly on cattle had a wider horizon, being obliged to move about in search of pasturage. Accustomed to the use of arms to guide and defend their flocks on the march, they knew how to use them to subjugate the tillers of the soil and exploit their labour. In Europe, as in Asia and Africa, the more mobile and warlike pastoral peoples subjugated the small settled farming groups and united them into a people which they governed. The descendants of the ancient peoples with unknown names of the neolithic and Bronze ages became the subjects, and the newcomers provided the rulers and dominant class. Apparently they brought the Indo-European languages into Europe, as into Persia and India. These languages had devices (declensions, conjugations) for expressing relations by changing the forms of words and putting words together on a system (syntax) by which the part played by each word is indicated by its place in the

phrase. They gave the peoples of Europe the means of expressing and conceiving subtle shades of thought far more precisely than do the uninflected languages of the yellow peoples of Asia.

Conditions of life of the peoples of Europe

The calculations which have been made with a view to determining the total population in ancient times are based only upon scarce and not very reliable data. The density of the population varied far more between one land and another than it does today, for it depended entirely upon the means of subsistence furnished by each. It was highest in the regions with a warm climate and the best methods of cultivation, on the Mediterranean, where all the towns were to be found; it was lower in the less civilized regions on the Atlantic, but higher in Gaul, where the soil was more fertile than in Spain and Great Britain, and very low in all the rest of Europe, which comprised the greater part of the Continent.

The mode of life of each people depended upon the chances it had had of acquiring the knowledge and practices of that civilized life which had come into being in the East. The peoples nearest to the East had learned from the Orientals the practical arts, the use of money, alphabetic writing, architecture, and sculpture. They had adopted the habit of living in fortified towns and arrived at the condition which we call "civilized." (This term, derived from the Latin word *civitas*, implies that civilization grew up in the towns.) They were the Hellenes, established in Greece and later in the islands and on the coasts of Asia and southern Italy, who later served as models to some of the Italian peoples. All the other peoples in Europe remained in the state known to the Greeks by the disparaging name of *barbarians*, which passed into Latin. They practised only rough mechanical processes, had neither money nor writing, and still lived grouped in villages; even the fortified enclosures of the peoples of Gaul and Spain were hardly more than refuges for the inhabitants of the countryside and their flocks in time of war. Yet they did not live in a state comparable to that of savages in other continents.

Material life was restricted by the natural resources of the land, which were still very poor; the soil, being badly tilled, produced a very feeble yield of perhaps three grains for one, the dung-heap was badly supplied and insufficiently used, and the soil rapidly became

exhausted; the cattle, restricted to natural pastures, were badly nourished and puny and gave little milk. When the crop failed, the people were reduced to starvation. Every family made the things which it required for its own use: flour and bread, stuffs and clothing, leather and footwear, implements, wooden plough, vessels, and furniture. The only artisan working for hire was the blacksmith, whose art, which was often kept a secret, was reputed to be magic; he manufactured weapons.

The chiefs enjoyed an abundance of food and a luxurious supply of servants and ornaments. The great mass of the people lived wretchedly, dwelling in little, dark, damp thatched huts, with no windows or floor, or else in round huts from which the smoke escaped through the roof, sleeping on heaps of straw or leaves, feeding upon oatmeal porridge or rye, griddle-cakes of barley-meal or unleavened wheat, drinking nothing but water, wearing a scanty garment of coarse woollen or linen stuff, and using no vessels save of wood or baked earth. They had no writing, and education was confined to oral tradition. There are no records to give us any knowledge of the life of women; we can only picture them confined to cold or smoky dwellings, absorbed in the laborious toil of pounding grain, preparing food, spinning and weaving stuffs, and helping the men in the fields.

Social and political organization

Each of the populations combined under a common name (Iberians, Gauls, Latins, Samnites, Germans) was divided into small peoples entirely independent of one another. Each had its own chiefs, government, capital, and army and made war on the rest. Their population and territory were of very unequal size, especially in the Greek or Italic lands, possessing only a single town and its neighbouring region. But none of them had a very extensive territory or a dense population like the peoples of the East.

Though each people was quite independent, they none the less all had a similar social and political system, for it was based upon certain common customs arising out of the fact either that the population was of the same origin or that it lived under similar conditions. Among all these peoples the family was monogamous and subject to a patriarchal authority. The man, as head of the family, possessed unlimited power over his wife as husband, over his children as father, and over

his servants as master. He had power to make them work unremittently, beat them, imprison them, and even kill them without anyone's interfering to prevent him. He gave his daughters in marriage to whomsoever he wished without consulting them. He disposed of the family possessions and exploited his lands at his own will. On his death his property passed to the sons who lived with him. Members of the same family were bound to render one another mutual support and avenge wrongs done to one or other of them. This duty of vengeance has survived among a few very isolated peoples, the Corsicans and Albanians. Families established in the same place for a long time regarded themselves as descended from the selfsame ancestor and formed a group of which the servants were also a part. It was called by a name implying a tie of common blood: *genos* in Greek, *gens* in Latin, and *clan* in Celtic. It is probable that there were slaves among these peoples, but we do not know whether they were numerous.

A combination of all the groups of families obeying the same authority constituted a people (in the narrow sense of the word) — that is, a body governed by the same chiefs and entirely independent. There were different systems of government, but they all possessed one feature in common, which caused them to differ profoundly from the system of the Oriental empires. Each people was too small and poor for the chief to possess material resources sufficient to create an army and treasury and force his companions to obey him like a god. Even when he was the sole chief, he did not possess unlimited power; he had to reckon with custom and, before arriving at a serious decision, to consult the council formed of the heads of families, or even the assembly of all the fighting men.

Among some peoples there had grown up a class of privileged persons who alone constituted the people's army (or at least its cavalry). They performed no manual work, lived on the labour of their servants, and had their lands cultivated by those of inferior rank. It is probable that among most peoples, the least civilized and the poorest, a large part of the people was made up of men who were at once tillers of the soil and fighting men, possessing weapons and going out to war; this might be seen among the more backward of the Greek-speaking peoples. Political life reduced itself to holding an occasional assembly to pass judgment upon some action regarded as

Religions

dangerous, or agree upon the vengeance to be exacted from some family, or arrive at some decision connected with war.

All personal relations had been established and were maintained by compulsion, by the use of force or the threat of it, in the form of beating, whipping, prison, mutilation, or death. The use of compulsion was so ancient and general that it seemed like an irresistible natural force; those subject to it felt it to be the natural form of all authority. The compulsion exerted by the father over the children, the husband over the wife, or the head of the family over the servants, was law to the family. Between one people and another the law was war, the supreme form of compulsion.

The difference between those who commanded and those who obeyed brought about a permanent inequality of status, for the power of command included the power of disposing of material possessions; that is, it conferred the right of property. The fighting men who wielded the force of arms formed a privileged class. Every society was divided into superiors and inferiors, and inequality of social position increased in proportion as a people grew more civilized.

All conduct was regulated by custom, which consisted precisely in what people had seen done by their elders. Custom regulated the processes of labour and transport, diet, clothing, housing, the way in which time was used, social relations, amusements, language, religious rites, and government. All ideas about the world and human life sprang from tradition and looked towards the past. Nobody was inclined to adopt new rules or prepare for a future different from the present. Hence changes were rare and very slow and were not brought about by any will to change. They were the result of necessities imposed by new conditions, above all by the increase of population, wars, and migrations.

Religions

Each people had its own religion, consisting in traditional rites, offerings, sacrifices of victims, human or animal, prayers, and gestures of worship directed towards the invisible forces imagined to be present in certain sacred spots — springs, woods, mountain-tops — or else towards natural forces — sun, wind, or thunder, represented by a symbol (a sword or fire) or an idol. What was asked of these

supernatural powers was, above all, success in undertakings and the healing of diseases.

The scrupulous care devoted to burial and the belief in ghosts common to all peoples prove that the dead appeared to be powerful, dread beings whom it was necessary to propitiate. This religious impression has survived to the present day in the form of funeral ceremonies and the laying of flowers on graves.

Amulets, the use of which is found in all countries, were intended to ward off the evil spirits which sent ill luck, and especially sickness, to man and beast; they are proof of the general belief in malignant spirits, which has survived in the belief in *spells* cast over persons or animals. The practices of magic, which came from the East, had as their object to conjure away — that is, to keep off — evil spirits by gestures or words intended to cure the sick person. The memory of this survives in the French expression “*conjuré le mal*” (to avert an evil). Moreover, the art of divining the future by consulting divinities or interpreting the *omens* supposedly sent by them was practised everywhere.

The practices of religion or magic exerted an often decisive influence over the actions of individuals and the decisions of rulers; an omen was sufficient to decide whether to undertake an action or not.

Neighbouring peoples often worshipped the same divinity. At times they even joined together to worship it in the same sanctuary. Examples are known of this in the case of the Greeks, Latins, Gauls, and Germans. But no religion united the populations of Europe as the Christian religion was afterwards to do.

Relations between peoples

The ornaments found in tombs, made of materials brought from remote places of origin, show that, as far back as the age of polished stone, trade was carried on by means of barter throughout the whole of Europe, whether by sea, along the coasts, or up the rivers, connected with one another by overland routes. Thus gold and silver came from the south of Spain, tin across Gaul from Great Britain, amber from the coasts of the North Sea and the Baltic, by way of Germany and the valley of the Po. But it was a trade confined to a few luxury articles.

The peoples had only transient relations with one another. They

often made war among themselves, not, as a rule, against a foreign population differing from them in customs, language, and origin, but chiefly against neighbouring peoples most resembling themselves: Athens against Sparta, Rome against Alba, the Ædui against the Sequani. The fighting men who governed the people regarded war as the most honourable occupation and the quickest way of acquiring honour, power, and even wealth, for the conqueror took everything that had belonged to the conquered, his crops, herds, and land, and either sold his captives as slaves or reduced the people to the position of subjects. Against this permanent threat of war, in which every individual risked losing everything, every member of the people felt the necessity of always keeping united and ready to defend his fatherland.

The peoples of Europe resembled one another in religion, mode of life, social and political institutions. But they were not aware of this resemblance, any more than they were conscious that they all spoke languages having the same origin. War kept them in a permanent state of mutual hostility. The unity of Europe already existed in the mode of life of its inhabitants, its disunion in the relations between the peoples. But they differed from the Orient in two characteristics which were preparing them to create a different civilization: Their religions did not impose definite enough ideas upon them to prevent them from seeking for knowledge based upon reason. Their governments did not possess a strong enough authority to prevent the mass of the people from seeking for a system of political liberty.

The peoples of eastern Europe, having greatly increased in numbers, have learned to take advantage of the great fertility of their soil and the enormous resources lying beneath the ground — iron, coal, petroleum — by applying the new technical processes invented by the peoples of the west. That part of Europe to which modern civilization penetrated last is also the one in which life is becoming most rapidly transformed.

GREEK CIVILIZATION AND ROMAN DOMINATION



The system of the Greek city state

Unity began to come into being towards the opening of our era among one portion only of the populations of Europe, and assumed two forms: unity of civilization, the work of the Greeks, and unity of government, the work of the Romans.

The people which laid the foundations of a common civilization for Europe inhabited the land at the south-eastern extremity of Europe, nearest to the peoples of the East with their ancient civilization. It had entered Greece from the north during the Bronze Age (before the sixteenth century B.C.) and established itself in cities (Mycenæ, Tiryns), whose walls still survive and whose chiefs kept up relations by sea with a people of unknown name settled in Crete, where objects and paintings pointing to a civilization coming from Asia have been discovered among the ruins of the palaces.

Later, towards the ninth century B.C., we find grouped under the new name of *Hellenes* all the small peoples speaking different dialects (Doric, Ionic, Æolic) of the same Indo-European language, worshipping the same gods, and believing themselves to be descended from the same ancestors.

As happened in all the European lands, the Hellenes were split up into a large number of small independent peoples. The most backward of them, neighbours of the barbarians of the north, continued to live grouped in villages and even to bear arms habitually. But most of them possessed a fortified town called a *polis*, which served as the market-town, centre of worship and seat of government for the whole

people. Their territories were of very unequal area. The most powerful of them exerted their sway over a whole region: Sparta over Laconia, Athens over Attica; but most of them possessed only a small district round their city.

The right of deciding public affairs did not belong to all the inhabitants, but only to the *citizens* (members of the city), who formed a hereditary privileged body. Qualification for citizenship did not depend upon domicile and belonged only to sons of citizens. They alone were admitted to the governing assembly and to the ranks of the fighting men. All the other inhabitants, slaves or descendants of foreigners, remained extraneous to the city.

Each people had its sovereign government, consisting of three organs, in accordance with a system which was practically similar in all the cities. But the real power exerted by each of the three organs varied with different peoples and differed within the same people at various periods. The principal authority had originally been the hereditary *king*, who was invested with a sacred character, being the leader alike in war, justice, and worship. But by the fifth century he had been either abolished or restricted to his religious functions, except in Sparta and Macedonia. The real power passed first to the *council*, formed of the richest landowners. Lastly the predominant organ became the *assembly* of the people, meeting in an open space to make laws and elect the heads of the government. Thus there had been three successive systems of government, to which the philosophers gave names still in use among all the peoples of Europe: *monarchy* (command of a single person), *aristocracy* (in which power is in the hands of the best people — that is, the old families), and *democracy* (in which power is in the hands of the people).

Many of the Greek peoples had, moreover, a temporary head who was sole ruler, possessed of absolute power, not in virtue of any hereditary qualification, but because he had a band of armed men at his service. He was called not by the style of king, but by the Asiatic title of *tyrant*. Tyranny, though occasionally popular during the seventh century, ended by being regarded as the type of immoral government, and it is in this sense that the word has passed into the European languages.

The Greeks accepted as legitimate none but chiefs drawing their authority from the consent of their peoples and exercising it within

Origins of Hellenic civilization

the limits of what they called *nomos*, a term implying binding rules of conduct. For long these rules were merely custom based upon tradition, but later they were officially drafted and transformed into written *laws*. Next most of the cities reached the stage of admitting that the law might be changed by a decision of the people's assembly and replaced by a new one. In like manner justice was at first administered in accordance with ancient religious rules by the king of an aristocratic council, but ended by becoming a process carried out according to rational rules by a tribunal of citizens.

The Greeks were proud of recognizing no master but the law. They felt themselves to be free men, superior to the subjects of the Asiatic kingdoms, who prostrated themselves before their king, known in Greek as a *despot*, and obeyed him slavishly.

Origins of Hellenic civilization

The Greeks had emerged from the state of barbarism common to all Europe earlier than any other peoples, by imitating the civilized peoples of the East, which had long since invented the arts useful to life (which we call by the Greek name of *technical* arts). Since excavation has revealed the details of these peoples' life, we are fairly well acquainted with the origins of each of them.

Most of the processes of agriculture and industry came from Egypt: the sickle and the wheelless plough, the cultivation of beans, lentils, and onions, the wheeled chariot, the working of metals, goldsmiths' work, the art of making glass, fine vessels, and perfumes, land-surveying, and papyrus, which for a long time remained the only material used for manuscripts. From Egypt or Asia Minor the Greeks learned to cultivate the vine and olive-tree, the use of wine and oil, the construction of temples and tombs, how to carve statues and bas-reliefs, the use of painting to decorate walls, fortifications flanked by square towers, and siege-engines for demolishing walls.

From the Chaldeans the Greeks borrowed all systems of measuring length, weight, or duration of time, the division of the circle into 360 degrees, and the instruments for measuring time — the *gnomon* (sun-dial) and *clepsydra*, or water-clock, the week of seven days, each day being sacred to a star (the sun, moon, and planets) and bearing the name of a Chaldean divinity, the observation of the stars, the use of silver ingots of fixed weight which had preserved their Chaldean

Expansion of the Hellenic peoples

names (*talent, mina, drachma*).¹ Later they adopted the Eastern invention of coining or stamping it with a mark, which turned the bar into *money*. To these were added astrology, which claimed to divine a man's future from the time of his birth, and the practices of magic and sorcery, which claimed to control the malignant spirits reputed to cause sickness and misfortune. From the East came the invention of *alphabetic* writing, in which every letter represented a sound, which reduced the number of signs to such an extent as to make writing and reading infinitely easier.

Religion had been transformed by the practices and ideas of the East, whence came the use of idols in human form, the belief in the survival of the *soul*, separated from the body after death, the idea of a subterranean abode of the dead and of a judgment on a man's conduct during his life delivered by the divinity after death; and later the *mysteries*, secret ceremonies in which the believer entered into symbolic communion with a god.

The technical processes learned by the Greeks provided means for carrying division of labour to such a point that a large number of crafts came into existence, each practised by a different kind of artisan settled in the cities. These Greek artisans perfected the arts of Oriental origin.

Expansion of the Hellenic peoples

The Greeks first settled in the land which has continued to bear their name, and caused the expansion of their people, political system, and mode of life by sending forth colonists, who, from the tenth to the eighth century B.C., went out and founded Greek cities, first on the coasts of Asia Minor and the Black Sea, and later on the coasts of the Mediterranean, in Sicily, southern Italy, and as far afield as Gaul and Spain. There they developed large territories more fertile than Greece, and "Hellenized" the inhabitants of the land by causing them to adopt the Greek language and customs.

From the end of the fourth century onwards the Greeks extended their dominion, customs, and language over a far wider area outside Europe. This was the work of Alexander, the Greek King of Macedonia. He subjugated the whole Empire of the King of Persia, who

¹ The legal processes described as early as the twenty-first century in the Laws of Hammurabi (contracts guaranteed by witnesses, rents, wages) probably came from Chaldea.

Creation of the sciences and arts

had already united all the civilized empires of the East under his authority. Having made himself master of all Asia as far as India, he reigned as absolute sovereign in the style of the Oriental kings and forced all his subjects, even his Macedonian companions, to prostrate themselves before him according to the Oriental custom.

After his death his generals divided up his vast Empire and founded hereditary dynasties of Greek kings. The king, surrounded by Greek courtiers and supported by an army of Greek soldiers, reigned over an indigenous population in the style of their former monarchs. He had himself adored as a divine personage and possessed absolute power, which he caused to be exercised by officials. He exacted the former taxes from his subjects, imposed forced labour upon them for carrying out public works, and amassed treasure. The cities founded by the kings were peopled by Greeks, Jews, and natives, who spoke Greek and lived in the Greek way. The kingdoms of Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, in which this mixture took place, have been given the name of *Hellenistic*, the term Hellenic being reserved to the ancient Greeks.

Creation of the sciences and arts

From the sixth to the fourth centuries B.C., a civilization grew up in the cities of Greece and the Hellenic colonies that was without precedent in the world. From the third century onwards it extended to the Hellenistic kingdoms of the East, where it came to perfection. It gradually spread to the other peoples and has remained the foundation of European intellectual unity. It had as its point of departure the knowledge acquired from the civilized peoples of the East by practical experience and handed down in the form of empirical laws. But the work of meditating upon the nature of things and the relations between them had been carried out by the bodies of priests attached to the sanctuaries in Egypt and Chaldea and dealt only with what seemed to concern religion. The Greeks, with the knowledge accumulated in the East to work upon, created a mode of thought so novel that it has been called the "Greek miracle" and attributed to some peculiar genius of the Hellenic race. As a matter of fact, it was the work of a small number of learned individuals, philosophers and writers, drawn from the remotest places, most of them, indeed, from lands where the population was not of Hellenic origin. Their work started as early as

the sixth century, in Asia Minor in particular, with the reflections of men known as *sages*. It was continued in the fifth and fourth centuries at Athens, which had become the centre where the *sophists* met, and afterwards the disciples of *Socrates*, who adopted the more modest name of *philosophers* (lovers of wisdom). It was completed from the third century onwards at Syracuse and in the Hellenistic lands, especially at Alexandria. It was there that men of learning — mathematicians, astronomers, geographers, and philologists — found a centre at the *Museum* (establishment sacred to the Muses, the divinities of the arts and sciences) and the *Library*, in which were collected the manuscripts of all the Greek authors.

The original method of the philosophers, and afterwards of Greek men of learning, consisted in proceeding by observation and reasoning, paying no attention to beliefs based upon tradition. They were acquainted with the religions and astrology of the East, but worked in a spirit entirely independent of religion and tradition, and even indifferent to the practical utility of knowledge, being solely concerned with getting to know and understand reality. Their curiosity, unconcerned with the application of their theories and detached from all religious authority, was the most ancient manifestation of the scientific spirit. For the first time in the world's history the Greeks employed a rational and critical method inspired by the desire to get to the bottom of things, so as to discover their true character and general laws. They applied it to mathematics, astronomy, physics, and even medicine and politics.

The Greek origin of almost all our sciences is still indicated by the names they bear in all European languages: *mathematics, arithmetic, geometry, mechanics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, physiology, geography, history*; and by the terms still in use in medicine: *surgery (chirurgery), anatomy, autopsy, symptoms, diagnosis*.¹ All our methods of thought are based upon the work done by the Greeks for the purpose of reducing the operations of the mind to general laws, and it is these Greek terms that are used by all the European peoples: for the art of thought we have *philosophy, metaphysics, logic, criticism, empiricism, scepticism*; for the art of speech

¹ When a new science or branch of science comes into existence, the custom has grown up in modern times of giving it a Greek name, such as *psychology, anthropology, palæontology, sociology, papyrology*.

Creation of the sciences and arts

grammar, rhetoric, metaphor, hyperbole; for history chronology, epoch, period.

The Greeks applied their rational method even to the practical arts of government and war. They created the theory of the governmental art, as is shown by the Greek words that have passed into the European languages: *politics, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, despotism*. They perfected the military operations of the East by inventing the *phalanx* of infantry, armed with a long pike and fighting in close formation, and created the theory of the military art, which still bears the Greek names of *strategy* and *tactics*. In order to train strong and active men for war, they invented a novel practice, peculiar to Greek life: the *gymnasium*, reserved to citizens, in which the young men, stripped naked, practised running, leaping, wrestling, and throwing the discus or javelin. Thus was created *gymnastics*, which was abolished by Christianity, but gradually became once more an art common to all Europe.

This rational and methodical spirit the Greeks also applied to their works of art, even when they were working for their religious festivals or buildings. They did not attempt to rivet attention by the enormous size of their works, as was done in the East, but to satisfy the reason by perfection of form and harmony between the parts. Their works appear beautiful by reason of their simplicity of method, restraint, and accuracy of proportion.

All the arts of expression were created or brought to perfection by the Greeks. They created *poetry*, which still bears its Greek name and all of whose varieties bear Greek names: *epic, lyric, didactic, theatre, comedy, tragedy, drama, ode, elegy, epigram*. They created oratory and history. The works of their poets, the speeches of their orators, the narratives of their historians, have become models imitated by all the peoples of Europe. The Greeks gave music its name, associated it with poetry by means of singing, as is indicated by the Greek words *chorus* and *hymn*, and initiated its theory. They turned dancing into an art by associating it with music and poetry, in the form of a group of persons of the same sex changing their posture by uniform movements following the rhythm of the music. They were also acquainted with dancing in the Oriental fashion, intended solely for the pleasure of the spectators, who watch the dancer, most usually a woman, moving the body while remaining on the same spot.

Formation of the Roman people

The plastic arts — architecture, sculpture, mural painting, ceramics — had been invented by the peoples of the Orient. The Greeks lent them a new kind of beauty due to perfection of detail, serene simplicity, and harmony between the parts. The Greek temple, constructed to be the abode of a god, and the Greek statue representing a divinity in human form, have remained the classic types of plastic beauty.

In every domain of thought and art, in philosophy, the sciences, letters, the arts of expression, and the plastic arts, the Greeks have been models and masters for all peoples and have paved the way for the scientific and artistic unity of Europe.

Formation of the Roman people

The Greeks, united only by a common civilization, never succeeded in achieving political unity even among themselves. Each people formed too self-contained a body to accept any common control. Political and social unity was the work of a people of Italy, which imposed it upon a great part of Europe. In its early days, from the eighth to the sixth century B.C., it had been quite a small people belonging to the Latin group, far less civilized than the Greeks, making a meagre living out of their cattle and a little tillage, and having no arts, no writing, and no money. It had as its centre Rome, a little town on the banks of the Tiber, and spoke the language of the Latins, which has preserved their name. Civilization was first brought to it by its neighbours, the Etruscan people, who had come from Asia, and who taught it the art of constructing the vault, the shape of the temple, and the art of divining the future from the flight of birds and the liver of sacrificial victims.

Rome had the same system of government as the other small peoples of Greece and Italy. The city, surrounded by a wall, governed the whole territory in which its various families had their fields, flocks, and houses. The people (*populus*) was a hereditary body formed of the members of the city (*civitas*), known as citizens (*cives*). It decided affairs common to the people; this is the meaning of the words *publicus* and *respublica* (the people's affair). At first Rome had only one head, known as *rex* (the king), a name which has passed into the Romance languages, whose duty was to act as commander in war or summon the assembly of the people. In the sixth century he was re-

Formation of the Roman people

placed by two *consuls*, elected by the assembly of citizens for a year only. Dignitaries called *magistrates*, elected for one year only, were gradually created for special functions, several of them being always elected for the same function. The council, called the *senate* (the old men), originally composed of the richest heads of families, but later of all ex-magistrates, was summoned by the consuls to give its advice (*senatus consultum*) on political affairs. The assembly of citizens was called together to elect the magistrates and vote the laws submitted to it. The consuls possessed almost absolute power, but only for a short period, and in case of public danger their place was taken by a single magistrate, the *dictator*, elected for six months only. The assembly of the people did little more than ratify the proposals of the magistrates. The senate, though possessing no official power, really took the lead in government. Rome always continued to be governed by an aristocracy.

As among the other peoples of Italy, the Roman army had originally consisted of the people in arms, under the command of its political leaders (*consuls*). All citizens were bound to equip and arm themselves at their own expense. Almost all of them fought on foot, wearing a cuirass, greaves, and a helmet, protected by a shield, and armed with a short pike; they fought in close formation several ranks deep, like the Greek phalanx.

The Roman people founded the political unity of Europe by the easiest process in a world permanently in a state of war: that of subjugating other peoples by means of war. It first subdued the peoples which had the same customs and mode of fighting as its own. As it subdued them, Rome made them enter its army in the capacity of allies (*socii*), fighting with the same weapons, but under the command of the Roman general. The phalanx was afterwards divided into small groups of from 60 to 120 men, and later concentrated into *cohorts* having the strength of a battalion of 1,000 men. The Roman army was reinforced by foreign mercenaries known as *auxiliaries*, who served principally as cavalry or slingers. Service in the army continued to be compulsory for all citizens, but by the first century B.C. it had become customary to recruit none but poor citizens, who enlisted voluntarily in return for pay and became professional soldiers. The commander was still a civil magistrate elected by the Roman people and assisted by young men of the aristocracy. There were no

The Roman conquest

professional officers except in the lower ranks: the *centurion* (company commander), who was a man of the people risen from the ranks.

The Romans do not seem to have been braver, more skilful, or more capable of endurance than their neighbours. They were less bold and vigorous than the Gauls of northern Italy and were frequently defeated in battle, but none of the defeats were decisive and Rome always went on with the war till it obtained a definitive success. It achieved this by very severe discipline. The commander-in-chief possessed the "right of life and death," symbolized by the band of *lictors* who accompanied him, armed with the axe for beheading anyone who was disobedient. This absolute power of compulsion kept the soldiers united even when fighting with side-arms. It was also the means of forcing them to labour at earthworks, which fighting men in other countries refused to do. When on campaign the army entrenched itself in a *camp*, surrounded by a fosse and defended by an embankment surmounted by a palisade, which protected it from surprise. It was able to operate rapidly and continuously, even for years on end.

The Roman soldier was prepared for fighting by long training in gymnastics and the use of arms. Later, when the commanders disposed of greater resources, the Roman army was provided with magazines for supplies, artillery consisting of *ballistæ* for hurling projectiles, and *battering-rams* for breaching walls, blacksmiths for repairing weapons, and engineers for bridge-building, which secured it a decisive advantage in a prolonged war against barbarian warriors, less well equipped and incapable of sustaining such a prolonged effort.

The Roman conquest

For seven centuries (from the seventh century B.C. to the first century of our era) the Roman people lived in a state of permanent war and subjugated almost all the other peoples without following any plan of conquest laid out in advance (as was long believed to be the case). It conducted its operations as chance provided the opportunity, making war either to acquire booty, to capture slaves, or to provide some general with the honour of figuring in a triumph. Later the object was to appropriate the treasure accumulated by the kings of the East and the gold and silver objects preserved in the

temples, and, finally, to supply a general with the means of attaching to himself the army which he afterwards used to make himself master of the supreme power. Thus Rome became mistress of all the lands round the Mediterranean and bordering on the Atlantic, the whole of Italy, all the Greek-speaking lands, all the kingdoms of the East, and all the barbarian peoples in the south and west of Europe.

The conquest of this immense territory caused a change in the population and government of Rome. It had begun by assimilating the inhabitants of the neighbouring lands which it had subjugated. At first they were admitted only as part of the *plebs*, and were long treated as an inferior category of subjects, but in the end the plebs became fused with the ancient Roman *people*. The qualification for citizenship was later conferred as a personal privilege upon part of the inhabitants, usually the rich men who had remained in the conquered territory, and even upon foreign slaves freed by their masters. Thus the body of Roman citizens continued to increase. It extended beyond the city till at last it included all free men in Italy to the south of the Alps.

The Romans had at their disposal all they had taken from the vanquished: vast tracts of land, treasures of gold and silver taken from the kings of the Orient, and crowds of slaves captured and sold during the wars. Only a small minority of privileged persons profited by this wealth. The higher class, formed of the families of ex-magistrates, adopted the name of *nobles*, which has survived as the designation of the upper class throughout the whole of Europe. A new aristocracy had also arisen, consisting of owners of money known as knights (*equites*), who used their capital either to carry on trade by sea, to farm the taxes and public revenues, or else to lend money at very high interest to the princes and cities subdued by Rome, for the nobles were not allowed to take part in any gainful occupation.

Rome became a very large city, filled with an enormous population of Italians, freedmen, and slaves of Oriental or barbarian origin, having no regular means of existence and living chiefly on the distributions of food or money by rich magistrates. The country districts of Italy had become depopulated, hardly any citizens remaining as small landowners.

The peoples subdued by Rome outside Italy had not yet been received into the body of the Roman people; they had been organized

The Roman Empire

in *provinces*, a name which has passed into the modern languages. Each of them was governed by a Roman magistrate possessing unlimited power, which he used, as a rule, to enrich himself rapidly by exploiting the population. Officially the political system of the Roman people remained the same. But since the first century B.C. the army had come to be composed of professional soldiers who would no longer obey anyone but their general. The elected magistrates who became leaders of the army waged war upon one another for nearly a century. Peace was restored when a single general, having conquered his rivals, remained sole master of the supreme power.

The Roman Empire

The conqueror, the heir of Cæsar, assumed the religious name of Augustus and the title of *imperator* (commander), from which the system of government derived its name of *empire*, which has passed into the modern languages. The Empire, of which the main lines had been laid down by Cæsar, and which was completed by Augustus, was founded, on the one hand, on the absolute power of the emperor over the Roman people and, on the other hand, on the absolute domination of the Roman people over the other peoples. The emperors completed the conquest by subduing the remaining barbarian peoples, till it reached natural frontiers which were easy to defend: in Africa and Asia the desert, in Europe the Rhine and the Danube, beyond which the lands were not worth the trouble of conquering. Germany, which had been subdued by Augustus as far as the Elbe, was abandoned; it was from thence that the barbarian invasions were to set forth in after years. In the second century, indeed, these bounds were overstepped in southern Germany and Transylvania by the submission of the Dacian people.

Officially the Roman Government continued to be the “people’s business” (*respublica*). It still had all the magistrates elected for a year and chosen from among the nobles, and the senate formed of ex-magistrates. But the emperor, having become the people’s delegate, had received all its powers — that is, absolute power. He chose the magistrates whom the people was to elect, made the laws, and led the armies. Yet he himself remained a magistrate, invested for life with a power which was not hereditary; the Empire was not a monarchy. No rule determined the succession; the emperor was some-

The Roman Empire

times chosen by the senate, but was often a general who had had himself proclaimed by his soldiers.

The Empire imposed upon all the subjugated peoples a unity consisting in obedience, and this ultimately established the same political system everywhere. With the exception of the peoples of Italy, which were governed direct from Rome, the whole Empire was divided into *provinces*, each consisting of a vast territory and governed by a delegate of the emperor or senate, who was an ex-magistrate sent from Rome. For this enormous Empire Rome employed only a very small number of agents; each province had only one governor with a few officials and a cohort of soldiers in his service. All the armies were concentrated in the frontier provinces, along the Rhine and Danube or in the south of Scotland, and consisted of professional soldiers paid by the Roman Government and recruited chiefly among the poorest populations, which had remained least civilized and most warlike.

The Roman Government did not concern itself with the internal affairs of the peoples. All it required of them was that they should not make war on one another and should pay the tribute and taxes on sales and inheritance established throughout the whole Empire for the maintenance of the armies. Each people retained its own local government, whose duty it was to maintain order and collect the taxes.

The system of government varied with the country, especially in the Greek-speaking lands. But the barbarian peoples of Europe, which adopted the use of Latin, imitated the Roman system. Each people had as its centre a *city* (*civitas*) where the staff of officials charged with governing the whole territory did its work. Magistrates, elected for a year and two in number for every function, as in Rome, controlled public affairs by agreement with a senate, known as a *curia*, formed of notables who owned land. Rome contributed nothing towards expenditure, the magistrates of the *civitas* had public works carried out at their own expense: markets, temples, theatres, aqueducts, and fountains. The assembly of the people possessed no real power. Everywhere, as in Rome, there was an aristocratic system which reserved all public affairs to the rich.

War within the Empire had ceased, all the peoples had disarmed and were living at peace; this is what has been called "the Roman peace (*pax Romana*)."

Unification

pire had never known before. All Roman subjects could work in security, enjoy their property, and go from end to end of the Empire by sea or on the roads constructed by the army. The towns could expand without needing to shut themselves up inside walls.

Unification

The uniformity of the governmental system had prepared all the populations of the Empire for unity. This became official at the beginning of the third century, when a law proclaimed all free men of the Empire citizens of Rome. Henceforth they all bore the name of Romans, which has clung to certain lands down to our own day. Nothing remained outside this unity save the still almost waste lands inhabited by the Celtic-, Germanic-, or Slav-speaking barbarians of the north. Political unity brought with it unity of language and law. Latin, the language of the government and army, became the common speech of civilized life, the only one that was written. It was also the language taught in the schools, except in the Hellenized lands of the south-east, which retained the use of Greek. No ancient languages survived except among a few isolated peoples: the Gaelic of Scotland and Ireland, the British tongues in England, Albanian in the Illyrian Alps, and Basque in the Pyrenees.

Roman law became the common law which regulated the customs concerned with marriage, property, inheritance, and contracts throughout the whole Empire. It was no longer the old national law of the Roman people, attached to traditional formulas, and applying rules without any concern for justice or humanity. It was a new law, slowly elaborated by collecting the judgments pronounced in law-suits between citizens and foreigners settled in Rome, and organized into a system by jurists of provincial origin, disciples of the Greek philosophers. Combining as it did the customs of different peoples, especially those of the East and the Greek lands, it retained nothing of the old Roman law but its language and formulas. It had become a "natural law" or "law of nations," common to all peoples, based upon a common ideal of equity, personal liberty, and humanity.

It is this rational character, resembling the spirit of Greek science, that has won for it the nickname of "written reason."

Roman civilization

The Romans possessed neither literature nor arts. They began by translating the works of the Greeks and went on to imitate them by producing works belonging to the literary categories created by the Greeks. Even the most famous of them, Virgil, Horace, or Cicero, followed Greek models in their works. All the sciences known to the Empire were an adaptation of Greek science. Sculpture and painting reproduced the works of Hellenistic art, and most of the artists, indeed, were Greeks.

The only art in which the Romans had any originality was architecture, and even in that they imitated the forms of Greek temples and theatres. But the Romans used far cheaper materials, stones and bricks held together by a mortar made of lime and sand, and practised the art, derived from the Etruscans, of constructing the *vault* and the *arch*. Thus they were able to erect far larger and more varied buildings: the triumphal arch, the *thermæ* (hot baths), the domed temple, the amphitheatre, circus and aqueduct, so solid that a large number of them are still in existence. The whole Empire was covered with a network of roads made by the soldiers for the purpose of transporting the government troops and posts. They were paved highways built of stone and lime and were carried across the rivers on arched bridges. So strong were they that remains of them still survive in many places. The establishment of communications by boat or by road between the inhabitants of different countries resulted in creating a community of customs, language, law, technical processes, sciences, literature, and art throughout the whole Empire.

This common civilization, known as Roman from the name of the predominant people, consisted in inventions drawn from the whole antique world, especially from the Greek lands and the Orient. The service rendered by the Romans was to popularize it by imitations inferior to their Greek models. It is enough to compare Cicero with Demosthenes, Virgil with Homer, Horace with Pindar, Plautus with Menander, Livy with Polybius. It was in this form, less beautiful and more vulgar than the Greek original, but better adapted to the low level of humanity at the time, that civilization was imparted to

Transformation of society

the peoples of Europe. They have felt the effects of this up to the present day.¹

Transformation of society

Society continued to evolve in the direction of an authoritarian and aristocratic system. It became increasingly split up into a very small minority of privileged persons possessing all the wealth and power and a great mass of the wretched and oppressed. The nobility, consisting of the old families of great landlords possessing an ancestor who had been a member of the Roman senate, became the "senatorial class." Families enriched by trade or the farming of the public revenues formed the class of "knights" (*equestris*).

These privileged classes possessed vast estates, used partly for raising flocks and herds, the people living upon which were dependent upon the landowners. Both nobles and knights had adopted the magnificent style of living of the kings and great people of the East. They had houses built for them in imitation of Oriental palaces, and sumptuous *villas* in the country decorated with paintings, paved with mosaics, and adorned with statues, at which they gave entertainments. There they lived surrounded by an Oriental luxury calculated to satisfy the vanity without making life more comfortable, a luxurious profusion of jewels, silken stuffs, perfumes, and gold and silver plate. They kept great troops of slaves for their personal service, and had thousands occupied in cultivating their lands, keeping their flocks and herds, or practising crafts, the products of which were sold for the masters' benefit.

This prodigious accumulation of wealth for the benefit of a few privileged persons had aggravated social inequalities. The land had become concentrated into enormous domains; few small landowners remained. New towns had sprung up, especially in the southern lands, and the population of the towns within the Empire had increased. It was made up of artisans, shopkeepers, manual labourers, and idlers, living upon the distributions of flour and oil made by the State. Known by the ancient Roman name of *plebs*, it was a population

¹ Roman literature has benefited in the estimation of the world from the fact that Latin became the common language of religion in Europe, and education was imparted by the study of Latin writers.

formed mainly of descendants of slaves, badly fed, poorly dressed, and miserably housed, despised and recognized by law as inferior.

The mass of inhabitants of the Empire consisted of *slaves*, *freedmen*, and cultivators (*coloni*) settled on the great estates. Among those peoples who lived simply — the barbarians, Greeks, and Romans of ancient times, who did their work themselves — slaves had been few in number. Slavery was mainly a product of Oriental civilization, a form of luxury practised by great people. It was said to have started in Greece, in the cities enriched by trade, and had become a general custom. During the Roman conquest the number of slaves had increased out of all proportion by the sale of barbarian captives. At a time when almost the sole source of power for labour consisted of animals and men, slaves were employed in heavy labour, turning the millstone in the flour-mill, extracting minerals, and carrying heavy burdens. Those known as “city slaves” rendered personal services to the master; most of them, known as “country slaves,” tilled the soil or kept the flocks and herds.

The slave, having the same position as a chattel before the law, might not marry, have a family, or possess property. He was in the power of his master, who had a legal right to imprison him, chain him up, have him flogged, mutilated, or put to death. Before the first century of our era we have hardly any information about this enormous mass of people of both sexes who formed the majority of the population. What we have comes from literary works, which paint an appalling picture of the conditions of life among slaves. In the country they worked without any day of rest, often chained up or confined at night in a subterranean prison. In the towns they lived under the master's eye, at the mercy of his whims, in constant fear of terrible punishments. Their status was so much despised that the term *servile* became synonymous with *degrading*.

The civilization of antiquity had improved the conditions of life for a small minority only. Half the human race remained outside its scope. The very scanty records of the life of women in antiquity (this is one of the most serious gaps in our knowledge) gives us no information about the part they played in the education of children or in country pursuits. The complaints of moral licence found in the Roman writers refer only to a few women of the aristocracy, whose conduct was, moreover, a public scandal. The rest — that is, almost

all of them — still led the simple, narrow life prescribed by custom among all the peoples of antiquity. Their life was spent in their homes, where their work consisted in spinning wool or linen and weaving cloth, kneading and baking bread, and cooking, which remained rudimentary throughout the whole of antiquity. They did not go to school and could not read; they were not admitted to public shows and took no part in intellectual life. They do not seem to have had much influence on the conduct of the men. The Greeks and Romans only married in order to have legitimate children; a wife in Rome was only esteemed in her capacity of *matron* — that is, mother of a family. The men of the Mediterranean countries have never been very inclined to spend much time in the family circle, concern themselves greatly with their wives, or leave them much liberty. The growth of slavery in the towns had lowered the status of a large proportion of women; we need only reflect to see what a degrading life it imposed upon the female slave, abandoned to her master's every caprice. It seems that among the barbarian peoples, where slaves were rare, the men associated their wives more closely with their life and work and allowed them to acquire a greater influence. But among all peoples husbands have continued to beat their wives up to very recent times and fathers to marry their daughters without allowing them any voice in choosing their husbands.

The enormous wealth of the privileged class brought no advantage to the mass of the people. The towns had not developed into centres of industrial production, but were still centres of government living on the produce of the surrounding country. It has been possible to trace among their commercial processes a few that are analogous to modern operations: joint-stock companies, bank deposits, long-term transactions, maritime insurance; but wealth had not assumed the form of capital employed in production for consumption.

The innovation which proved most important in the light of its consequences was the process by which custom, based upon oral and local tradition, was replaced by written law with a general application, in the form, not of a decision of the people, but of an *edict* of the emperor. In order to apply the law in particular cases, permanent courts of justice had been created, assisted by a class of lawyers, speaking in the name and stead of those concerned in lawsuits. Its scope also extended to acts prohibited as harmful to society; it pro-

nounced penalties and used the practices of the East: torture for the purpose of obtaining confessions, and cruel punishments intended to prolong the sufferings of the condemned persons — mutilation and crucifixion. These practices accustomed the peoples of the West to look upon justice as a general rule applied by authority.

Roman unity in time of peace had as its seamy side the wretched state of the population, delivered from war but sunk in servitude. The progress of civilization benefited only a small minority, which was alone admitted to the enjoyment of luxury and the pleasures of the intelligence. European education, based on the Latin writers, has accustomed Europeans to think only of these privileged persons; but Roman society, viewed as a whole, appears as a very thin layer of civilized people, whose civilization was mainly artistic, superimposed upon a mass of people almost as ignorant and destitute as the barbarians, and more oppressed. The relations between men were dominated by force even more than before the Empire, for authority was armed with a greater and more irresistible force. The natural liberty and equality of barbarian life had disappeared. Oppression and inequality had greatly increased.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE EMPIRE AND INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY

●

Decay of the political system

During the third and fourth centuries the unity of a large part of Europe, established by Roman government and civilization, underwent a transformation due to the direct action of the East, which turned the Empire into an Oriental monarchy and introduced into it an Oriental religion.

Society had undergone a change in the direction of increased uniformity, though divided into classes between which a growing inequality existed. The extinction of the old Roman noble families was by now complete. The class of the knights (*equites*) became fused with that of the nobility in a single class known as the "senatorial class," composed of families having an ancestor who had borne the style of "senator." It included the great landowners of the whole Empire. A state of affairs had ultimately come to pass by which all the smaller landowners had entered the *curia* of their city and formed a middle class known as the *curiales*. The mass of freemen, consisting of inhabitants of the towns (and perhaps of small landowners), known collectively as *plebs*, officially occupied an inferior status, being known as "the humble" and subject to severer penalties than the other classes. Now that Rome had almost ceased to wage wars, and thus keep the slave-markets stocked, the slaves who peopled the country districts were no longer numerous enough to cultivate the land. A new class had grown up, the *coloni*, or cultivators, poor free-

Decay of the political system

men settled upon a great estate, on which they cultivated a piece of land for which they paid rent. They, too, were still free before the law and attached to the soil from father to son, and in point of fact the great landowner was their master.

The armies had begun to undergo a change; they were composed of volunteers receiving a money payment and had come to be recruited more and more in the frontier provinces, where the population remained more warlike. The infantry legions still admitted none but citizens, but all the cavalry corps were recruited among foreigners, especially Germans.

The system of the Empire had begun to be shaken before the end of the second century, when the armies on the frontiers of the Rhine and Danube and in Syria fought among themselves to decide which general should become emperor. The crisis was arrested by an emperor, Severus, coming from Syria, but started again with renewed violence after 235 and lasted for more than half a century. For some years, indeed, there were several emperors at war with one another.

Till now the warlike peoples beyond the Danube and Rhine which were attempting to gain an entrance into the Empire had always been repulsed, but while the Roman armies were occupied in fighting among themselves, these barbarians invaded the northern provinces. They bore new names: *Franks*, *Saxons*, *Alamanni*, now mentioned for the first time. (It appears that they were names of confederations.) They ravaged the countryside, destroyed the villages, and massacred the inhabitants. The remaining population was reduced in numbers and the aristocracy impoverished. The towns were rebuilt, but only by withdrawing within a narrow wall, and were left small and wretched.

Wealth in gold and silver had diminished. Through its conquests the Empire had concentrated in Rome the precious metals accumulated by the kings of the East; but it hardly produced any more and was constantly exporting it to pay for the products of India and China: pearls, jewels, spices, perfumes, silks. The barbarians increased this loss by carrying off into their lands the gold which they had looted. The inhabitants buried their treasure in hiding-places, where a great deal of it has been found. The result was a shortage of money, as is proved by the unprecedented debasement of the currency in circulation in the Empire. The gold piece (*aureus*), containing 5.14 penny-

Restoration of the Empire

weight of fine gold, and the silver coin (*denarius*), containing 2.186 pennyweight of fine silver, had been debased by constantly increasing alloy of copper. As early as the end of the second century it amounted to half the total weight; by the end of the third it had risen to as much as ninety-five per cent in the silver coinage.

This shortage of precious metals had a disastrous effect upon the army. So long as it had been paid in silver, it had been recruited with professional soldiers superior to the barbarians in the military art, for they knew how to march, camp, manœuvre, and carry out a concerted action. But this required frequent drill and strict discipline, which called for permanent cantonments where the soldiers were occupied exclusively with their training. When money ran short, the government, in lieu of pay, gave them supplies in kind and lands and allowed the soldier to keep his family with him on the land. The frontier armies became a militia of soldier peasants unsuited to a war of operations, and the active army was reduced to a few corps, of which the barbarian auxiliaries came more and more to form the principal part.

Restoration of the Empire

The Empire was saved in the last quarter of the third century by a succession of emperors who were soldiers in the army of the Danube recruited in Illyria, men of the people risen to be generals, who remained illiterate and uncultured, though brave and active, leading a simple, rough life like that of the Romans of ancient days. They drove back the barbarians and once more established peace. The government was restored by the last two of them, Diocletian and Maximian, and afterwards by Constantine. This Empire, reconstituted on a new system, has been called Lower Empire (or Late Roman Empire).

The territory of the Empire, being too vast to be governed by a single man, was divided between two emperors bearing the title of Augustus and residing, one of them, for the West, in Italy, and the other, for the East, in a new capital created by Constantine, who gave it his name, Constantinople. This division, still provisional during the fourth century, became definitive at the beginning of the fifth, though the Empire still maintained its unity officially, as was indicated by the presence of both emperors' names on official documents.

Restoration of the Empire

The Western part, made up of all Latin-speaking lands, included all the provinces of Europe except the Balkan Peninsula, where Greek was spoken. Europe, whose civilization, of foreign origin, was recent and adapted under a Roman form, remained separated from Asia, whose far more ancient civilization had preserved its Greek form.

Establishing himself on the frontier of Asia, Constantine adopted the customs followed from time immemorial by the kings of the East and carried on by the Greek kings. The Emperor ceased to be a magistrate for life and became a sacred, hereditary monarch, wearing a diadem on his brow, seated upon a throne, and being saluted in the Oriental fashion by prostrations. All that belonged to him was called *sacred*, his palace, his chamber, his dominions. He lived surrounded by a large court of dignitaries bearing titles and performing functions analogous to those of the Hellenistic courts of Egypt and Syria. He no longer had at his service Roman magistrates serving for short terms, but a permanent staff of officials, each charged with a single kind of work and assisted by subordinate employees organized in departments (*scrinia*), who rose from grade to grade in such a way as to form what has been called a *hierarchy*. This was the first example in Europe of government by a hierarchy of officials. Our knowledge of it is drawn from a *Notitia dignitatum* (List of the dignitaries of the East and the West), in which are enumerated all the court dignitaries and officials of the government and army.

The highest offices in the central government, the departments in charge of finance, the Emperor's palace, and his domains, were given to men in his entourage known as "companions (*comites*)" of the Emperor; this is the origin of the title of *count*, which has become one of the titles of nobility throughout the whole of Europe. The former provinces were divided into two or even several smaller provinces, each of which had a civil governor known as the *president*, *rector*, or *judge*, chosen from among the aristocracy of great land-owners and charged with administration, justice, and the supervision of finance. The military leaders were men of low birth recruited among the professional soldiers. The frontier provinces were entrusted to a commander known as a "leader (*dux*)"; this is the origin of the title of *duke*, which has remained in use throughout the whole of Europe.

Resources in money and soldiers had greatly diminished. To

Effects of the Late Empire

build them up again the emperors strengthened the machinery for procuring material resources and men. To make sure of getting in the land-tax, the territory of every *civitas* was divided into financial units, each paying the same amount of taxation; all lands were entered in a register, together with their equipment and crops and the number of cultivators attached to the soil. In order to reach trade and industry, the *chrysargyros* was created, a tax in "gold and silver" levied every fifth year (known as the "year of indiction," which still figures upon our calendars). The agents of the treasury used harsh measures in collecting the taxes. Christian writers blame them for using confiscation and the whip, perhaps even torture, against the insolvent, an ancient practice in the kingdoms of the East. There were also import dues and tolls levied upon merchandise, called in France the *tonlieu* (*teloneum*), which lasted down to the Middle Ages.

Money having become too scarce, the Government paid its officials and soldiers in kind — that is, by grants of bread, wine, oil, bacon, cattle, forage, stuffs, and wood, which it obtained by commandeering them from the inhabitants. It also imposed forced labour upon these for purposes of transport, postal services, carrying messages, and public works for the upkeep of the roads, as well as the liability to provide board and lodging for passing officials, which survived throughout the Middle Ages. The legions provided for by these grants in kind had been broken up into detachments forming the garrisons in the frontier provinces. The campaigning army came to consist more and more of barbarian auxiliaries.

Effects of the Late Empire

Their burdens having become far heavier, the subjects of the Empire endeavoured to escape them. The *curiales*, as landowners jointly responsible for the payment of the land-tax for their *civitas*, abandoned their property. The merchants and artisans, subject to a heavy tax, abandoned their trade or craft. In order to check this desertion the Government adopted a device which seems to have been imitated from the kingdom of Egypt. It made social position and professions obligatory and hereditary. The *curiales* were bound to the *curia* of their *civitas*, the artisans to their *college*, or craft corporation, soldiers' sons to the army. The cultivators, whether slaves or freeborn

Effects of the Late Empire

coloni, were entered upon the registers of taxpayers and became an inseparable appendage of the domain, which they no longer had the right to leave. The landowner had no right to remove them from it. The whole territory of the Empire was now united, not merely under the same domination, but under the same political and social system, controlled by a centralized government with a uniform body of officials at its service, working according to uniform rules, and having under its absolute power a society divided into well-defined classes, in which all advantages were reserved to a very small aristocracy of landowners.

Under a Latin name, and in spite of the Roman titles of Emperor and Senate, it was a hereditary, absolute monarchy, sacred in the Oriental fashion. This system had the same effect upon the population as upon the subjects of Oriental kingdoms. The inhabitants of the Empire, having been disarmed for centuries and subject to a distant government which allowed them no share in public affairs, had ceased to feel themselves members of a community capable of inspiring them with affection and acts of self-sacrifice, as did those of the cities or the small barbarian peoples, because they played an active part in it and might be called upon to fight in its defence. They had become subjects, ready to obey the Government and incapable of resisting it, but had no patriotic feeling for the Empire, which made itself felt only by exploiting them. Kept apart from political life, they remained indifferent to the public weal, every man being interested only in his own private affairs or personal safety.

This inertia had spread to the arts and literature. Nobody was now capable of producing original work. Artists confined themselves to copying ancient works and were limited to a small range of subjects; the art of that time produces an impression of depressing uniformity. Writers composed nothing but imitative work in affected or declamatory language, intended for a narrow public of amateurs accustomed to appreciate nothing but virtuosity of language. It is a literature of the schools, consisting of commonplaces, conventional, obscure, and empty, lacking in content and personal thought. Only among a few Christian writers, indifferent to the things of this world and inspired by sincere religious sentiment, did a little poetry make its appearance; but they too had been formed in the school of the

The religions of Europe in antiquity

rhetoricians and wrote the same language. The schools, reserved for the sons of rich families, taught nothing but “grammar” and “rhetoric,” which consisted in studying the Latin authors and composing verses and discourses in the taste of the age. The rational thought of the Greeks had not penetrated to the Latin schools of Europe, and even in the Greek-speaking lands scientific research had been checked. Philosophy, restricted to the Neo-Platonic school, was degenerating into the Oriental forms of magic and a belief in the magic power of numbers.

Christianity

To this inert population, having no original intellectual life and accustomed to passive obedience, was brought a foreign religion coming, like the political system of the Late Empire, from the East. It revolutionized all religious habits, and even the fundamental conception of morality, and ended by imposing upon the peoples of Europe a new kind of unity opposed to all their traditions. This religious and moral revolution had been preceded by a slow process of assimilation affecting the religious of the different peoples in the Empire.

The religions of Europe in antiquity

The religions of all Europe had always consisted in the rites of worship, together with the local beliefs handed down by tradition among every people, without any body of doctrine or class of religious persons organized for instruction in religion (except, perhaps, the Druids in Gaul and Britain, whose teaching had become extinct). The priest was merely the guardian of a sanctuary, charged with carrying out the ceremonies. The rites of worship, even those which were obligatory, imposed no definite belief. These religions admitted of two systems of rites and beliefs of different origin, which had always remained distinct.

The cult of the dead, which was probably more ancient, since it existed in neolithic times, made it obligatory to bury the dead according to the rites, in order to prevent them from becoming maleficent. The fear of ghosts, to which Latin writers bear witness (Plautus, Pliny the Younger), remained firmly rooted in the whole of Europe. Ancestor-worship had ceased, but the veneration of tombs still went on, till it took the form of the cult of saints.

The other category of practices presupposed a belief in super-human and invisible natural forces which revealed themselves in some manifestation of power, such as a thunder-clap, and often by healing, which gave the cult a practical value. The object of prayers, offerings, and sacrifices was to obtain the aid of the invisible forces. The Greeks had given these the names of gods or goddesses, representing them by idols in human form and attributing to them adventures the stories of which constituted *mythology*.

The Romans, who had at first worshipped much vaguer divinities, had assimilated them to the Greek gods by attributing to them the same form and history, while retaining their Latin names. Some of these still survive in the Romance names of the days of the week (Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, Saturn). The barbarian peoples subject to Rome also assimilated their divinities to these Greek ones with Roman names, which became common to the whole Empire. The cults organized by the official authorities in Rome had not destroyed the cult of the local divinities attached to sacred spots; it survived in the country districts till after the end of the Empire. But the belief in the power of one divinity did not prevent people from believing in the power of another; the cult of one god was in no way incompatible with that rendered to another. No religion demanded belief in a single god or forbade people to worship a foreign one. The cult of a few Oriental divinities was practised in the countries of Europe, especially that of Isis, derived from Egypt, Cybele, derived from Asia Minor, and Mithras, derived from Persia. This amalgam of religions, known as "syncretism," which resembled the amalgam of Roman civilization, seemed to be preparing the way for religious unity, when it was supplanted by a more powerful religious system of a totally different nature.

The precursors of Christianity

The new religion originated in the Hellenized lands of Asia in contact with Egypt and Chaldea, where for more than thirty centuries past corporations of priests had been elaborating a doctrine as to the nature of the divinity and the destiny of man after death. Beliefs from these old religions had been combined with religious practices of a different origin, the *mysteries*, of which we have little knowledge, because they were kept secret.

These mysteries, which had come from lands foreign to Greece (those of Isis from Egypt, those of Adonis from Syria), consisted in secret ceremonies connected with religious beliefs based upon ideas and sentiments foreign to the peoples of Europe. The believer was only initiated into them after tests symbolic of purification and expiation, intended to free him from the forces of evil. He received instruction, represented as a divine *revelation* reserved for the initiated and promising *salvation* through the intercession of supernatural powers. He next took part in symbolic ceremonies in which the death and resurrection of the god were represented, which gave him the impression of participating in the very being of the god through a symbol of *communion*. This feeling of having been in direct personal communication with the Godhead lends its precise significance to the word *mystic*. The mystery created a fraternal bond between worshippers of the same god.

From the religion of the Persians had come the explanation of the world as a constant struggle between two divine powers, a God of light and goodness and a God of darkness and evil. This spirit of evil was called by the Jews Satan, and in the Hellenistic lands the *Devil*. The Persian idea of the Devil, together with the belief in a sojourn underground (hell) for the souls of the dead, combined with the mystical idea of salvation through the intercession of a God, produced the doctrine of *dualism*, which was to become one of the bases of the new religion. These conceptions corresponded to sentiments which were very strong in the East: the belief in maleficent powers, the need to feel oneself protected against them by an infinite power, the hope of obtaining pardon for one's sins by *expiation*, and, after the misery of this life, entering into a perfectly happy life without any end. Fear of the Devil as master of hell aided by subordinate spirits, known as *demons*, was henceforth to cause men in Europe to live beneath the terrifying menace of maleficent powers and an eternity of suffering.

Practices of another order had penetrated into the Hellenistic world through the example of men who, under the Greek name of "philosophers," had adopted a way of life common to the Hellenized Orient and India, called by the Greek name of *asceticism* (exercises). Asceticism had as its object to deliver the soul from the bondage of the body in order to raise it to a state of ecstasy in which it entered

into communication with the divine world. It weakened the body by fasting, vigils, immobility, and silence, devices employed by the fakirs in India. The philosophers claimed that by these means they acquired a supernatural power, manifesting itself in miracles, especially those of healing, and even in the resurrection of the dead. They were known as "miracle-workers" (*thaumaturges*), and their power was expressed by a Greek word translated into Latin as *virtus* (strength). Their acts were narrated in biographies calculated to arouse religious emotion. They were works of edification written by Orientals indifferent to truth, who considered it laudable to relate the greatest possible number of prodigies in order to strengthen the reader's faith. It has been thought possible to recognize in these ascetics the precursors of the Christian monks, and in the biographies of the thaumaturges the model for the *Lives of the Saints* and collections of miracles. These works have in common the practice of lying, known as "pious fraud."

Origins of the Christian religion

The new religion which originated in the Hellenized Orient, in Asia Minor, had its origin among the Jewish people, who possessed a religion based on a doctrine revealed in sacred books, but still remaining a national one. The Jews had made proselytes among the other peoples, but imposed Jewish practices upon these foreign proselytes, among others circumcision.

Christianity had originated in a dissident Jewish community which, renouncing the national Jewish practices, had assumed the form of a universal religion broad enough to embrace all peoples. St. Paul, who gave it this unlimited field of action, has been called "the apostle to the Gentiles." It was in the Hellenized cities of the Orient, at Antioch in Syria and Alexandria in Egypt, that it assumed its definitive form, by adapting itself to the sentiments current in these countries, fear of the Devil, an ardent desire for salvation, the hope of resurrection, asceticism, and faith in miracles.

Survivals of its Jewish origin were: the Easter festival, Sabbath rest (transferred to Sunday), and the veneration of the Jewish Holy Scriptures, written in Hebrew and called the Old Testament, to distinguish them from the books written in Greek known as the New Testament. But the Jewish prophets had predicted that the *Messiah*,

the descendant of David, King of the Jews, would come and reign over the other peoples, thus realizing the reign of God pending the not far distant end of the world. It proved necessary to drop this prediction, which was rudely contradicted by events. The Messiah ceased to be a king and became the *Saviour*, who delivers believers from the power of Evil; and the end of the world was postponed to an indeterminate future. Of the Jewish customs preserved by the Christians the one that was to become most important in practice was the frequent meeting of the faithful, who assembled to read the sacred books, comment upon them in discourses, and sing psalms — an assembly called by the Greek name of *synagogue* (assembly).

By the end of the first century the Christian religion had become Hellenistic. All its constituent elements had received Greek names, which have passed into all the languages of Europe, either in their Greek form or in a Latin translation: *Christ* Himself and his *Christian* worshippers; the sacred books, including the writings of the *evangelists*, *epistles*, *apocalypse*; its doctrine: *dogma*, *orthodoxy*, *heresy*, *Saviour*, *Logos* (in Latin *Verbum*, in English *the Word*); its beliefs: *Devil*, *angels*, *demons*; its practices: *baptism*, *eucharist*, *catechism*, *homily*, *hymn*, *exorcism*, *asceticism*; its institutions: *ecclesiastic* (from the Greek word *ecclesia*, church), *synod*, *diocese*, *parish*, *canons*; the persons in the service of religion: *apostle*, *bishop*, *priest*, *deacon*, *acolyte*, *anchorite*, *monk*, *hermit*. In the Hellenistic cities were founded the most ancient churches and held the first *œcumenical* (universal) synods, which fixed the orthodox dogmas; there the most celebrated doctors, known as “the Fathers of the Church,” who definitively formulated Christian beliefs, preached and wrote. It is a Greek word, *catholic*, which marks the universal character of the religion. Even in Europe itself there were for a long time no churches save in the cities where Orientals lived, and the faithful spoke and celebrated their worship in Greek. The popes of Rome in the earliest centuries bear none but Greek names, and the oldest accounts of martyrs, those of Lyons, are written in Greek.

In the East almost all Christians had at first been people of humble position, or even slaves; the hope of an eternal life of bliss made them indifferent to the misery of their present life and inspired them with a contempt for worldly possessions. A trace of this remains in the Gospels, especially in that of St. Luke, for they expressly condemn

riches and threaten the rich with eternal punishment. The parable of Dives and Lazarus expresses the hope of a reversal of fortune in favour of the poor in the future life. A few passages breathe such passion that it has been possible to compare them with Socialist or Communist formulas and to denounce the "revolutionary ferment" of the Gospels. Every time the Gospel was translated into the vulgar tongue, from the twelfth century onwards, a similar protest against social inequality was to go up. But the authorized heads of the Church have always repudiated this subversive interpretation and, following the example of St. Paul, have ordered the faithful to obey the authorities and accept inequalities of rank.

In the East, however, in spite of differences of social position, Christianity accustomed the faithful to a sort of fraternal equality among all Christians. It made no attempt to do away with the subjection of women, or even with slavery, but it may have obliged the Christian master to treat his slaves humanely, respect Christian marriage between slaves, and allow them the possibility of having a family. The example of the Apostles tended to rehabilitate manual labour, which the Greek philosophers had declared to be degrading to a free man. The rules of conduct imposed on relations between the sexes accustomed Christians to austerity of morals.

The Christian religion was in harmony with the sentiments of the Hellenized peoples of the East who had created it; it was there that it produced its beneficial effects upon moral life. In Europe it appeared as an alien thing, brought in by foreigners and taught in a foreign language in the foreign colonies of the great cities. Almost all the martyrs were foreigners, and up to the beginning of the fourth century Christianity remained unknown to almost all the indigenous population. It was established at a single stroke by order of the Government, at the personal will of an Emperor, Constantine, the son of an Illyrian general and a Christian mother of low extraction, for reasons which have remained unknown, for we cannot see that it was in any way to his interest to do it.

The establishment of Christianity in Europe

Constantine did not attempt to suppress the other religions, but moved his capital to an eastern city in a Christian land and summoned

for the first time a general assembly of bishops from the whole Empire at Nicæa in Asia for the purpose of putting an end to a violent quarrel among Christians over the dogma concerning the nature of Christ. He forced the assembly to formulate a confession of faith, the *Nicene Creed*, which should be binding upon all Christians, thus formulating as a rule of absolute law religious opinions which had remained controversial. He imposed upon the heads of the Christian Church an authoritative discipline which prepared the way for an obligatory unity of belief in Europe.

The Christian religion, having become that of the Emperor, was imposed upon the whole Empire in the course of the fourth century, first as privileged and afterwards as obligatory, by the example and at the order of official persons. The Government favoured the bishops by treating them as high State officials; it exempted them from public office, gave them great estates, and recognized their power to judge the faithful. It went so far as to place its power of compulsion at the service of the new religion; it forbade the celebration of other cults and ordered that the sanctuaries of the old religion should be destroyed.

The Emperor behaved as supreme head of the Church. He took part in disputes on dogma and, himself deciding matters of doctrine, deposed refractory bishops, replacing them by their opponents. During the long dispute over the nature of Christ the Government supported now the partisans, now the opponents of the dogma of the Trinity, according to the personal preference of the Emperor. Just as he had forbidden the practice of all other religions, so the Emperor forbade the profession of any other than the dogma declared to be *orthodox* (the right opinion) by the authority of the Church. All other doctrine was declared to be *heresy* (individual opinion) and the heretic was to be punished by death. The Church had become an official institution of the Empire; it was not the spontaneous conviction of Christians which had secured the absolute unity of doctrine within the Church, but the material power of the Emperor.

Organization of the Church in the cities

During the fourth century in Europe the Christian religion was as yet practised only by the inhabitants of the cities, the country popu-

lation preserving its ancient cults.¹ Every Christian community had its own heads and celebrated its worship in the town which was the centre of a *civitas*. Christians of all ranks whatsoever, even the slaves, were members of it, as sons of God and *brethren* in Jesus Christ, equals in religion and able to aspire on equal terms to eternal salvation, the same beliefs and rules being binding upon all. But as a matter of fact the Christian community, which, following the example of Roman society, was aristocratic and authoritative, was divided into a governing and a subject class. The governing class, known by the Greek name of *clergy* (clerks) was invested with full authority and possessed a power as absolute as that of the officials of the Empire. The subjects, known by the Greek name of the *laity* (people) or the Latin name of *plebs*, owed passive obedience to the clerics. The relations between them were expressed by a forcible metaphor which is still in use: the plebs were the "flock," and the clerics the "pastors."

The head of the community, the *bishop*, was possessed of all powers. He presided over the assembly of the faithful and appointed and consecrated the auxiliary clerics composing the clergy (priests, deacons, subdeacons) and the subordinates in "minor orders" (acolytes, exorcists, doorkeepers). He administered the property of the Church, dispensed alms to the indigent, directed the religious instruction of candidates for admission to the Church (*catechumens*) and those to become clergy, and preached before the assembly of the faithful. He alone administered all the sacraments, even baptism and the Communion. To compel the obedience of the faithful, he had power to order them to perform very severe *penances* and to *excommunicate* them; that is, to exclude from the community those whom he judged to be either heretics or guilty of some very great crime. He represented the community in its dealings with the Imperial authorities. He exercised unlimited power, like that of the Empire and free from all supervision, over all Christians on the territory of the *civitas*.

The bishops of every province met in a *synod* (in Latin, *council*), copied from the provincial assemblies of the Empire, and presided over by the bishop of the chief city (*metropolis*) of the province, who decided upon disciplinary measures and acted as judge in conflicts

¹ The name *pagan* (peasant), given by the Christians to those believing in the ancient cults, apparently means "countryman," but it appears that in the language of the fourth century it designated the civil as opposed to the military population and was a term of contempt.

between the clergy. The councils sought to maintain unity of doctrine among all the churches. Following the example set by Nicæa, the bishops of the whole Empire met from time to time in a council which was called *œcumenical* (universal) and formulated a single doctrine, binding upon all Christians. Within the unity common to the whole Empire, all the Latin-speaking churches of the West recognized a primacy of the bishop of Rome, called by the Oriental name of *Pope*.

The monks

Apart from the communities of the faithful presided over by the bishop, a new type of religious persons, of Oriental origin, appeared in Europe before the end of the fourth century. Their mode of life, which was new to Europe, rested upon the idea that society is wholly bad and human nature inevitably inclined towards evil; the true Christian ought therefore to cut himself off entirely from the world and combat his natural inclinations by the method described in the Greek word *ascetic*, already practised by the “philosophers.” In the East they had begun by retiring into the desert to lead a solitary life — whence their name of *monk* (solitary). Next they had gathered together to lead a solitary, ascetic life in common, whence their name of *cenobites* (those who live in common), under the command of one of their number, known by the Syrian name of *abbot*. In Latin their communities took the name of *monastery* or *convent* (meeting). They undertook to renounce everything which then seemed to make life pleasant by taking the solemn vow of obedience, chastity, and poverty. They wore none but coarse garments, ate only scanty food with no meat, and in order to mortify the flesh — that is, the body viewed as the source of evil — inflicted suffering upon themselves by means of fasting, vigils, the hairshirt, and flagellation.

Towards the end of the fourth century the monks, leaving the desert, came into the towns to preach to the multitude and destroy the sanctuaries of the ancient cults. At first their attitude shocked the European bishops. The Pope censured “these vagrants calling themselves monks, whose lives one cannot know, nor whether they have been baptized.” The monks became popular by the same means as the Eastern thaumaturges: they worked miracles, especially those of healing. The people attributed to them a supernatural power acquired by their ascetic life, which seemed to raise them above the common run

of men. The monks were soon regarded in Europe as sacred beings and, though they received no official power, exerted a moral authority over the faithful equal or even superior to that of the ordinary clergy. They formed what is called the *regular* clergy (subject to a rule).

Christian unity

The Christian religion revolutionized the religious habits of Europe. Not content with ritual ceremonies and vague and variable beliefs, it demanded above all *faith* — that is, a feeling of confidence and hope of salvation through the action of Christ the Saviour, and belief in a system of doctrines formulated in a definite “confession of faith.” It explained the nature of the Deity, His relations with humanity, and the destiny of man after death; it promised for the other life an eternity of happiness in paradise or an eternity of suffering in hell. From this it drew rules of conduct for the present life, regarded as merely a preparation for the future life, thus making eternal rewards, or punishments the recompense of the faith and conduct of believers.

The Christian religion had adapted itself to the Empire by organizing itself on the same geographical lines, the *civitas* and the province, and adopting its political system — that is, the absolute power of the rulers over a mass of people reduced to passive obedience — together with its aristocratic basis; for the bishops, the heads of the Christian community, were usually chosen from among the great families. It tolerated no other religion and forbade as a crime the worshipping of other divinities, which the Christians called false gods, thereby meaning not that they did not exist, but that they were sent by the Spirit of Evil. In the ceremony of *baptism*, which had originally been a bath of purification, according to the Oriental custom, and had afterwards become the sign of admission into the Christian community, the bishop put the question: “Dost thou renounce Satan, his following (*pompa*; i.e., of demons), and his works (the cult of the gods) . . . ?”

But the new religion, if it preserved the same organization as that of society, upset the scale of values in the life of the European peoples. All things which, in accordance with the instincts of nature, had constituted the value of the present, visible life — honours, power, wealth, and pleasures — became a matter for contempt. That which had been

despised — humility and obedience, poverty and abstinence — was honoured as the surest means of attaining felicity in the future, invisible life. Interest was transferred from the real world, known through the senses, to the world which was imagined on the strength of the book of Revelation. Thus in the part of Europe subject to the Empire — though at first it affected only the inhabitants of the towns — a strict unity of religion became established, which in the course of succeeding centuries was to permeate the whole population and extend to the whole of Europe.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE BARBARIANS IN THE EMPIRE
AND
THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

•

Origins of the change

Roman domination had divided the peoples of Europe into two worlds: on the one hand, the Imperial world of the south and west, civilized and pacific, united in a single civilization derived from Greece and the East, under the same absolute government and with the same aristocratic social system; on the other hand, the barbarian and warlike world of the north and east, very poorly populated, having no towns, leading a rude and simple life, divided up into small independent peoples whose chiefs possessed only a power limited by custom. The new religion coming from the East had not yet made its way either into the barbarian world or among the people of the country districts inside the Empire. This state of affairs was upset between the fifth and seventh centuries by two events occurring simultaneously but independently of each other: the establishment on the territory of the Empire of a new population which had remained outside the Roman civilization, and the spread of the Christian religion outside the towns.

We possess only scanty and not very trustworthy information about the period during which the life of Europe underwent this transformation. Since the barbarians could not write, all we know about them is their deeds as related and interpreted by Greek or Roman

The Germanic peoples

foreigners, and we do not know how they would themselves have explained their motives or expressed their feelings. All accounts of them were written by ecclesiastics and tell us only what the clergy understood of the feelings and conduct of the laity. These accounts reduce themselves to the *Lives of the Saints*, composed for the edification of the faithful, a few scanty chronicles, and the works of four historians, covering a period of three centuries: Gregory of Tours, Jordanes, Paulus Diaconus, and Bede.

The barbarian peoples

The way was prepared for the transformation of Europe by the entrance into the Empire of a number of barbarian peoples, followed by a general shifting of the peoples in that part of Europe which had remained barbarian. These peoples differed from one another in origin, language, and mode of life. Some were nomads, but belonged to the yellow race coming from the plains of Asia. The peoples who replenished the population of Europe all belonged to white and settled races and spoke Indo-European languages belonging to two different groups: the Germanic languages in the west and the Slav languages in the east. The custom has grown up of calling peoples by the name of their language, the former peoples being known as Germans and the latter as Slavs; but neither the Germans nor the Slavs constituted races in the anthropological sense of the word — that is, a species of mankind presenting the same physical characters. They were collections of men of different types having in common their language and customs and the idea that they were of common descent; this is why they are called by the same name.

The Germanic peoples

Among the peoples speaking Germanic languages, and especially those in the north, there seems to have been a higher proportion than in any other possessing the physical features of the type known as *Nordic*: tall stature, powerful build, large feet and hands, white skin, blue eyes, and blond hair, a type unique in the human race and becoming more frequent as one goes farther north. They have been classified into two branches according to their dialects and customs.

Their own traditions have it that the peoples of the north-eastern branch came from the Scandinavian peninsulas, where none of them

have remained save the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, who are still the purest representatives of the Nordic race. Having crossed over to the southern shores of the Baltic, they first settled (during the first and second centuries) in the region of the Vistula and Oder, and then migrated across Europe as far as the Danubian lands. The most famous of them in heroic legend are: the *Burgundians*, *Vandals*, and *Goths*. On the Danubian plain they found Iranian peoples, known to the Romans as *Sarmatians* (and *Alans*), coming from Persia, speaking an Indo-European language, and distinguished from all other peoples of antiquity by their mode of fighting. The other peoples, even the Greeks and Romans, used neither stirrups, saddles, nor horseshoes and had only light cavalry fighting with the sword. The Parthians, who had established themselves in Persia, rode in a cuirass formed of metal plates or rings, but fought with the bow, discharging their arrows as they rode away from the enemy. The Alans, protected by an armour resembling that of the Parthians, fought on horseback with a long lance. It is probable that they had stirrups and saddles and shod their horses' hoofs with iron. The Germanic peoples which had migrated into the south-eastern plains adopted this mode of riding and fighting on horseback and carried it with them into western Europe, where it was later to revolutionize the art of war, to give birth to chivalry and remain the universal practice of armies down to the end of the Middle Ages.

The peoples of the western branch had settled between the Elbe and the Rhine in lands inhabited by a Celtic-speaking population, traces of which survive in Celtic place-names. The pure Nordic type is rare in this part of Germany. Before the end of the second century they had undergone a great change, for none of the names of previous peoples are to be found in the second century, with the exception of the *Frisians*, isolated on the shores of the North Sea, and the *Suevi*, a powerful people which had come from the banks of the Elbe and established itself to the south, where its name survives in that of the *Swabians*. In their place three new names of confederations appear in the middle of the third century: in the north the *Saxons*, between the Elbe and the Weser, having as their neighbours on the east some small peoples settled in the south of Denmark (Jutes, Angles, Langobardi). In the centre the *Franks* held both banks of the lower Rhine. In the south the *Alamanni* (whose name perhaps indicates a mixture of

side the Empire have called it the "Migration of the Peoples." It was, in fact, a migration similar to those which for more than a thousand years past had drawn the peoples of the north towards the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

But this migration coincided with an invasion ¹ of a very different character, by peoples of yellow race coming from Asia, who succeeded one another on the plains of eastern Europe down to the end of the Middle Ages: the Huns in the fourth and fifth centuries, the Avars in the sixth and seventh, the Petchenegs in the ninth, the Hungarians in the tenth, and the Mongols from the thirteenth century onwards. Mounted on swift little horses, fighting with bows and arrows, and more cruel than the European barbarians, they massacred the inhabitants and tortured their captives. They struck terror into the populations and ruined the lands they invaded, without leaving any lasting settlement except in Hungary.

The German peoples which succeeded in settling inside the Empire were no stronger than those which had failed. None of them was very numerous (it has been thought possible to estimate the total population of Germania at one million). It was the Government of the Empire which had become weaker. It no longer had enough money to pay its armies and preferred to take bands of barbarian warriors into its service. This cost it less and it could count on the probability that a barbarian in command of an army would not try to have himself proclaimed Emperor, as was often done by a general of Roman origin.

The Germans became established within the Empire by different processes. At first they consisted of bands conquered by the Romans and deprived of their leaders, which the Government established as *coloni*, cultivators attached to the soil, on the great depopulated domains. Later they consisted of bands of warriors who placed themselves at the service of the Empire and were cantoned in garrisons in the provinces, where they received payment in supplies and land. And lastly, there were whole peoples which, by a contract between their king and the Emperor, were established in some part of the Empire with the title of ally (*fœderati*). The Government then or-

¹ Historians who have desired to give a precise date to the barbarian invasion have chosen the year 376, when the people of the Visigoths, fleeing before the Huns, took refuge to the south of the Danube, inside the Empire.

dered the great landowners to hand over part of their lands and slaves to the barbarian warriors. The people retained their chiefs, and often their hereditary king.

At first the barbarian kings remained officially in the service of the Emperor, but as a matter of fact they extended their cantonments and ended by behaving like independent sovereigns. Their dependence upon the Emperor was weakened when Rome was taken and sacked by the barbarian Vandals who came by sea from Africa. It ceased when in 476 the leader of the bands of barbarians settled in Italy omitted to have an emperor proclaimed and sent back the imperial insignia to the Emperor at Constantinople, who henceforward remained the sole one.

A few peoples established themselves in the Empire without any official compact with the Emperor, either by fighting against the Roman armies, like the Vandals in Spain in the fifth century or the Langobardi in Italy at the end of the sixth, or by subduing the inhabitants by force in a land abandoned by the Government, like the Saxons and Angles in Great Britain.

The invasion took place on no coherent plan, by a series of local enterprises due to the initiative of a few barbarian chiefs over a period lasting more than two centuries. There were a few peoples which migrated several times: the Visigoths first entered Bulgaria, then passed on into Italy, and later into Gaul, and ended by establishing themselves in Spain; the Langobardi, coming from the North Sea, crossed Europe as far as the Danube before settling in Italy.

All the Germanic peoples were warlike, but they made war in different ways according to the lands through which they had passed. The peoples coming from the Danubian plains, who were entirely severed from their land of origin, entered the Empire as horsemen armed with lances and formed quite a small aristocracy among the Roman population. This was the case with the Vandals, Burgundians, Goths, Alamanni, and Langobardi. The peoples coming from the shores of the North Sea, who remained near their country of origin, the Franks, Saxons, and Angles, fought on foot with the pike and battle-axe, protecting themselves with shields carried on the left arm, and drawn up in a dense mass many ranks deep, which hurled itself against the enemy. The chiefs alone rode on horseback; their warriors had not means enough to procure a horseman's equipment,

possessing only weapons that cost little, a wooden shield, and no defensive armour.

Invasion of the Slav peoples

The Slav-speaking peoples migrated later and occupied only a very small part of the territory of the Empire in Europe. Like the Celts and Germans, they did not constitute a race. The Byzantine and Arab writers of the sixth and seventh centuries described them as having red (or red-gold) hair. Today several types are to be found among them differing greatly in stature and colouring; those in the south are almost all dark-haired, and the fair-haired ones in the north have ash-blond hair different from that of the Nordic type.

The Slav languages are Indo-European, but belong, like Persian, to the eastern group and seem to have remained closer to the common tongue. The differences between the languages of the various Slav peoples have become fixed, but are slighter than those between the Celtic or Germanic families of languages, being scarcely more marked than those between the dialects of one language. The mode of life of the Slavs is very little known to us, our information coming from the tombs that have been excavated, which are very poor in finds, and from a few passages in foreign writers (Byzantine and Arab and, much later, German), who speak only of the peoples settled near them: the Slavs in the south and the Wends in the west.¹

They were poorer and the peoples which they formed weaker than the other barbarians. They grew chiefly millet, lived partly upon milk or cheese, wore the skins of beasts or coarse woollen stuffs, and had long hair and beards. They occupied low huts destitute of furniture, and with a hole pierced in them to allow smoke to escape, and slept upon benches. The fighting men were poorly armed and had no defensive armour; their chief mode of warfare was by means of surprise. Those who entered the Empire formed only very small peoples, without a hereditary chief. The name which was later applied to the king or prince (*knez*) in the Slav languages was borrowed from a Germanic language; the Byzantines described their mode of government as "democracy."

Their land of origin, which is still a subject of controversy, seems

¹ The various features of the life of the Slavs are known only for a few peoples, chiefly those of the south and west. We do not know how far these were common to the rest.

to have been the region to the north of the Carpathians, between the upper Vistula and the Dnieper, whence they dispersed in three directions. In fact, they have, indeed, been divided into three groups, one in the south, one in the west, and one in the north.

The southern Slavs first known to us, who are mentioned at the siege of Constantinople in 627, had been established as early as the seventh century in Illyria, a region then almost depopulated. They next spread through almost the whole of the Balkan peninsula and penetrated to the Peloponnese at its far end. Nothing was left of the previous population save the little Albanian people, which has preserved its language (*shkipetar*), a remnant of the Romanized colonists in Dacia (Transylvania), speaking a Latin from which Rumanian¹ is derived, and some groups still speaking Greek on the coasts and in the Greek islands. But the Slavs do not appear as compactly organized peoples till much later.

The western Slavs occupied the lands abandoned by the Germans, the whole of Bohemia, and the region extending from the Vistula to the Elbe, and even the Saale. They formed groups referred to by the chroniclers under vague Latin names (*populus, gens, natio*); all their leaders in war are called princes.² The northern Slavs do not appear till later.

Effects of the invasion

The barbarian invasion caused a displacement among the peoples of Europe and a change in the mode of life of the population. In the almost unpeopled regions of the north, to the east of the Elbe and Saale, it substituted for the Germanic peoples far weaker Slav ones, living a still more barbarous life. In the lands between the Rhine and the Meuse, between the Danube and the Alps, and in the south of England it subdued or destroyed the Romanized population, replacing it by Germans who retained their own language and customs.

¹ The Rumanian population established in the plain to the north of the Danube went there at the end of the Middle Ages from the mountains of Transylvania; but the Albanian words which have survived in the Rumanian language seem to indicate that it had begun to fall back to the south of the Danube, whence it seems to have been driven back later into Transylvania by the invasion of the Slavs.

² The name Slavs is found in various countries: in the Alps — the Slovenes — and on the shores of the Adriatic — the Slavonians, whose name has come to have the meaning of "slave" in the European languages, having replaced the Latin *servus* at the time when the slave-markets were stocked chiefly with Slav captives.

Even the populations civilized by the Romans in Great Britain, Gaul, and Spain ceased to receive further orders from the Imperial Government and, living as they did in contact with the barbarians, adopted habits of disorder and war which caused them to revert to an almost barbarous condition. Thus the invasion had as its result the enlargement of the area of land occupied by barbarian and warlike peoples and a shrinkage of the domain of civilized life. It had put an end to the "Roman peace" and brought Europe back to a state of permanent war.

To contemporaries the immediate consequences appeared disastrous. The barbarians had ravaged and depopulated the country districts and sacked and destroyed the towns (remains of burnt towns have been discovered in England). The towns were left in ruins or shrank to very small dimensions, and craftsmen almost disappeared.

The conditions of civilized life on the antique model gradually disappeared even in the Latin-speaking lands. As early as the end of the fifth century there were no longer any theatres, gymnasia, or schools left. The towns, which were the centres of civilization, were now no more than large villages enclosed within a narrow space of from five to seven and a half acres, and no new ones were founded for four centuries. The roads survived, but were badly kept up; a little trade still went on with the East by sea, but the traders were Syrians or Jews. The barbarians did not know how to read, and even ecclesiastics wrote little and in an increasingly barbarous Latin. Spoken Latin became so much changed in use that the people no longer understood the written language. The population of the ancient Empire was reverting to barbarian conditions of life.

It was only at the extremities of Europe, which had been spared by invasion, that a few traditions of civilized life were preserved under a Christian form. This happened in southern Italy and on the shores of the Adriatic, which had remained under the dominion of the Emperor and kept up a connection with Constantinople by sea, and in Ireland, called the "isle of saints," where the monks, living in their monasteries, kept alive the arts of writing and ornamenting manuscripts in the Eastern style.

We have no records enabling us to estimate how far the race became modified in the lands invaded. The numbers of the barbarians are unknown to us, the figures given by Roman writers being absurdly

exaggerated. The majority of these peoples migrated too often and too far to have been able to move about in great masses. But in a land emptied of its inhabitants a few thousand immigrants might have sufficed in the course of a few centuries to give birth to a large population, as is proved by the example of the Canadians in America and the Boers in Africa. In the attempt to recognize what contribution each barbarian people made to the land in which it settled we are thrown back upon observing the present type of the inhabitants, their language and place-names, and the shape of their houses. It appears it differed profoundly between one region and another.

Throughout the whole south — Spain, Italy, and southern Gaul — as far as the central mountain mass, no traces remain of the Vandals, Visigoths, or Ostrogoths. Scarcely any of the Burgundians are to be found and very few of the Langobardi, though their name is still attached to a country. All these peoples were horsemen, settled in lands in which a Romanized population survived, and the language and law remained Roman.

In the northern regions — Great Britain, northern France, Belgium, and southern Germany — a remarkable proportion of individuals of Nordic type is to be found today and a fair number of Germanic place-names, customs derived from Germanic private law, and even a Germanic language — Saxon in England, Flemish in Belgium, German in Bavaria, Swabia, and Switzerland. On the left bank of the Rhine the Latin-speaking lands have shrunk by more than 50,955 square miles. Even in the Romance-speaking lands a great many Germanic words have entered the language (in French more than five hundred). These were the parts of the Empire depopulated by invasion, where even the towns were destroyed. They were re-settled by barbarian families, drawn mainly from two peoples, the Franks and the Saxons, among whom the warriors fought on foot and formed a mass of free men who were half-peasants. They were not far from their land of origin, from which they continued to receive immigrants. The Alamanni and Bavarians settled in a land which had reverted to an uninhabited state, and there gave rise to a population which, though not Germanic in type, spoke a Germanic language in Bavaria, Swabia, and Switzerland, except in the mountains of the Grisons, where the Romance tongue known as Roumansch has survived.

The invasion of Great Britain

The Romans had never subdued either the far north of Great Britain or Ireland. After the withdrawal of their armies the Celtic-speaking peoples, which had remained barbarous and warlike, invaded the adjacent regions. The Scots, coming from Ireland, occupied part of Scotland, which still bears their name. The Britons, who had become Christians while retaining their Celtic language, remained long independent and were divided up among a number of petty indigenous kings who waged war on one another. The Germanic barbarians, Jutes, Saxons, and Angles, who had been coming from over the sea since the middle of the fifth century, established themselves on the coasts in small bands, the Jutes in the south-east, the Saxons in the south, and the Angles in the east, and very slowly subdued the interior of the island. Gradually they spread towards the centre and west, into parts by that time depopulated, for the place-names there are derived from a Germanic tongue. They set up small centres of domination known by geographical names: the three Saxon territories of the East Saxons (Essex), South Saxons (Sussex), and West Saxons (Wessex), and the two Anglian lands of Norfolk and Suffolk. The Britons, attacked on two sides by the Germans and Scots, gradually withdrew into the interior, where most of them ended by abandoning their own language. Bands of Britons, fleeing before the invasion, crossed the Channel and settled at the far end of Gaul in a depopulated region, where the people grew up which still retains its Celtic language and the name of *Bretons*.

The political system

In the lands occupied by a barbarian people the barbarian king became a chief governing a territory. Thus the Empire was parcelled out among a number of small chiefs. But it cannot be said that the Roman Empire split up into kingdoms as did Alexander's Empire. The term *kingdom* employed by historians is inapplicable here, for it assumes a permanent territory handed down according to a fixed rule of succession. As a matter of fact, the title of king always remained a personal one and the territory subject to the various kings always varied, being sometimes divided among several sons, some-

times combined under a single one, sometimes increased by conquest, sometimes decreased by revolts. Up to the eleventh century the kings in Europe were to bear the name not of their territory but only of their people (King of the Franks, not King of France). It was simply a matter of the predominant power. Most of these rulerships were destroyed by war: that of the Burgundian kings in Gaul by the Franks; that of the Ostrogoth kings before the middle of the sixth century in Italy by the Imperial armies; that of the Visigoth kings in Spain at the beginning of the eighth century by the Moslems. None survived except those of the Langobardi in northern Italy, and the Angle and Saxon kings in Great Britain.

The most powerful was that of the Frankish kings in Gaul. It was the personal work of Clovis, the king of a small band which had subdued almost all Gaul with the aid of the bishops, who were the heads of the Roman population. His sons completed the conquest of the territory of the king of the Burgundians and subdued the peoples of southern Germany, the Alamanni and Bavarians. They destroyed the rule of the king of the Thuringi and occupied the region of the Main, which took the name of *Franconia*. This was the most extensive and permanent of these rulerships. In Great Britain, where the Britons were not subdued till the seventh century, the two most powerful kings were those occupying the two extremities: the Saxon king of Wessex, who had enlarged his territories by reducing the indigenous Celtic population to the position of an inferior class, and the Anglian king, who had united the whole region known as Northumbria; no more British kings survived in the interior. The Celtic language was gradually ousted by a Germanic one and survived only in Scotland and Wales.

The impersonal government by special officials established in the Empire could no longer be understood by the barbarians and was replaced by a far more primitive system, which varied according to the size of the barbarian element in the population. Where a not very numerous barbarian people had settled in the midst of a Roman population — for example, the Ostrogoths in Italy and the Visigoths in Spain and the south of Gaul — the king retained to some extent the procedure of the Imperial system. But impersonal power cannot be maintained in dealing with barbarian warriors, accustomed only to

Transformation in law and procedure

relations based upon personal sentiment; and the government depended mainly upon the person of the king, who was invested with a vaguely defined power over all his subjects, whether barbarian or Roman. The king, the hereditary leader in war, had all the fighting men under his command, and it was he who issued orders for them to appear under arms at the appointed meeting-place and start out to war, under pain of a very heavy fine. This order, known as *Heerbann*, was sent out to all free men in a position to provide themselves with arms. He also maintained an escort of warriors, attached to his person and permanently in his service. In the ancient lands of the Empire he had assumed possession of the domains of the Imperial treasury and collected their revenues, and he sometimes attempted to levy the old taxes. He possessed a hoard of gold and silver and had resources at his disposal in money and kind for paying his escort.

To secure the obedience of his subjects in his territories he dispatched to every chief town of a *civitas* a warrior bearing a Roman title — in Gaul and Spain *count* and in Lombardy *duke* — charged with the royal powers of summoning the fighting men and leading them in war, maintaining order, levying tribute and fines, administering the royal domains, and presiding over the court of justice which dealt with lawsuits and crimes. In Brittany and Germany, where there were no towns, the king's lieutenant, charged with the government of a district, bore a Germanic name, in Germany that of *Graf*, translated into Latin as *comes*, and in England that of *sheriff*.

The king's effective power depended upon his personal energy. With an energetic king like Clovis, King of the Franks, or Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, it might be absolute; but under a weak king or a child monarch, like the later Merovingians, it was weak or ineffectual. When the royal line became extinct and the title of king was disputed by competitors or seized by a usurper, it grew more feeble.

Transformation in law and procedure

In those lands in which Romance-speaking inhabitants still remained, the two populations, Roman and barbarian, lived side by side for three centuries without mingling. Each preserved its costume and mode of life and its laws regulating family matters and inheritance. Lawsuits were tried according to either legal system:

the Roman law or the customs of the barbarian people (Frank, Goth, Burgundian, Langobard, Alamannian, Bavarian). The king further issued ordinances, known under the Empire as *edicts*, which were equally binding upon all his subjects, barbarian or Roman. Thus a common body of rules grew up, preparing the way for the creation of a common law of the land. But the customs of the barbarians, which were very different from the Roman law, reacted upon the conception of property and even upon judicial procedure.

Roman law recognized the absolute power of the person owning land to sell it or dispose of it by gift or bequest. It authorized parents to give their daughter a *dowry* on marriage, which the husband had no right to alienate. The customs of the barbarian peoples regarded the land as the indivisible property of the family (in the broad sense of the word) and did not allow the individual to bequeath or sell it, or at any rate reserved to his relatives the right to buy it back again. They united the property of husband and wife in a joint estate of which the husband alone had the disposal. The woman received no dowry, but the husband might settle a jointure upon her.

In the lands under Roman law, the possessor of an estate had the right to cultivate it as he chose. The agrarian system of the Germanic peoples made it binding upon all owners of land in the same village to cultivate it in a certain way.

As regards crime, Roman law gave the government officials power to prosecute any subject suspected of a crime and pronounce sentence upon him, even of death. The barbarians had preserved the ancient system of the European peoples, which punished only actions regarded as harmful to the people, such as desertion; the king also punished acts which he had forbidden by edict. But crimes against individuals remained the family's concern, and it was the duty of the victim's relatives to avenge him by making war upon the guilty man and his family. In order to prevent these wars between families, which disturbed the peace of the land, the authorities forced the guilty man or his family to "compound" with the victim or his family by paying compensation proportionate to the gravity of the damage and the value attributed to the victim, or even, perhaps, proportionate to the greater or smaller risk of vengeance. What was known in Latin as "the price of a man," and in the Germanic languages as the "*wergild*," was fixed by custom according to his rank

in society. It assessed the value of every part of the body: the hand, foot, or eye. These tariffs of damages make up a large part of the customaries, books containing the customary "laws of the barbarians."

When one free man accused another of a crime, the accused man might clear himself by bringing before the court of justice a number, fixed by custom, of good men and true who swore that he was not guilty; they were known as "*conjurators*" or "*compurgators*." Among the Franks the tribunal gave orders for a combat between the two adversaries with the same arms, and the loser was found guilty. This is the origin of the duel, unknown to the antique world, which afterwards became a general custom in Europe.

Men of inferior position, and, as a rule, women accused of a crime, were subjected to a test in order to prove their innocence, such as carrying a bar of red-hot iron or plunging their hand into boiling water. This procedure, called in Latin *ordalia* (English, *ordeal*), from the Germanic word *Urteil*, was regarded as a "judgment of God" and accepted by the Church, which confirmed it by a solemn ceremony.

The different value attached to individuals by the custom of the *vergild* shows that society was divided into classes which were regarded as unequal. At the bottom were the slaves (*servi*), above them the freed men (known as *litæ* among the Saxons), then the free men who formed the fighting force (known to the Saxons in England as *ceorl* and to the Langobards as *arimani*).

The upper class of the various peoples differed in character. The Franks had no ancient nobility and it also disappeared among the other peoples established in the Empire. Nobles survived among the Saxons in Germany and England, where they were called *eorl*. But among the Franks, Langobardi, and Visigoths a new upper class grew up formed of the king's intimates (known as *convivæ regis*), his lieutenants, and the bishops and great landowners, which became fused with the ancient Roman nobility. As early as the end of the sixth century the Roman nobles were wearing the Germanic costume and giving their children Germanic names. Writers referred vaguely to these privileged persons by a Latin name meaning "the great ones."

The numbers of those belonging to the different classes are un-

Change undergone by Christianity in the Roman lands

known to us. In the countries of the Empire, in which the land was split up into very large domains, the great mass of the population was probably composed of slaves or *coloni*, subject to a not very numerous class of great landowners and warriors; but we do not know how many free men owning small parcels of land survived. It seems certain that free men of moderate position, who were both fighting men and landowners, were far more numerous in the Germanic-speaking lands — in England, Germany, and the region between the Rhine and the Meuse, inhabited by the Franks of Austrasia.

Change undergone by Christianity in the Roman lands

While invasion by new peoples was renewing the population of Europe and revolutionizing its political system, moral life was undergoing a simultaneous transformation as the result of the new religion which was penetrating into the depths of the country districts and spreading beyond the borders of the Empire.

In entering Europe from the East the Christian religion had changed its character. The sentiments inspiring the earliest Hellenized Christians were on a higher plane than those of the subjects of the Late Empire. Love of God was eclipsed by the fear of hell; brotherly love (*caritas*) was becoming transformed into an official charity confined to giving *alms* (*eleemosyne*, the Greek word for “pity”), granted only to the utterly destitute, often in the form of money gifts. The theological controversies over the nature of Christ and the Virgin which had had an impassioned interest for the Greek Christians of the East had little for the Christians of Europe. Only one heresy sprang up among them, that of Pelagius, a British priest living in Rome in the fifth century, and this was over the doctrine of free will and sin — that is, it was concerned with a practical matter, the means of obtaining salvation. What the Roman peoples appreciated were the ceremonies of worship, the ritual practices of piety, and, above all, rules of conduct, as precise and uniform as the rules of Roman law, presented in the form of commands or prohibitions: the duty of attending worship and receiving the *sacraments*, of fasting, abstinence, and alms; the prohibition of working on Sunday, of marriage between relatives, of relations between the sexes outside wedlock, of performing any act connected with the ancient religions, or of practising divination or magic. Practical penalties attached to

these rules; for any breach of them was a *sin*, exposing the sinner to eternal punishment, and could only be effaced by *penance*, an act of repentance accompanied by a penalty, which was often very harsh. Grave sins were punished by *excommunication*, which made the sinner a religious outlaw. The power of pronouncing these penalties at the “tribunal of penitence” gave the clergy the authority of a judge.

To make religion practicable for ignorant peoples, the clergy in Europe had simplified the doctrine and forms of worship and reduced instruction to a few articles grouped in a short “confession of faith.” It had shortened the liturgy and made church music easier by creating “plain chant.” To induce the people to abandon the ancient indigenous religions the clergy had no need to destroy the old beliefs. It was enough for them to condemn the ancient worship as being paid to demons, the enemies of the true God. The clergy destroyed idols and even their sanctuaries, but it did not trouble to ban the holy places, to which the people in the country districts were attached and where miracles and cures took place. It was sufficient either to celebrate Christian worship there or to consecrate the spot to a saint, who continued to work miracles.

In order to secure a uniform application of the rules of religion, the clergy endeavoured to establish a single authority. Doctrine which was to be binding upon all the faithful must be decided by councils. But in the fourth century Christians had disagreed over the dogma of the Trinity, and the first barbarian peoples to embrace Christianity — the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Langobardi — having been converted at a time when the Emperor was an Arian, adopted his religion and remained Arians. They had priests of their own nation who read them the Gospel and possibly celebrated worship in their language. The inhabitants of the Empire who had remained faithful to the orthodox doctrine established by the Council of Nicæa detested them as heretics. Religion was the cause of an irreconcilable aversion between the barbarian kings and their Roman subjects. The barbarian peoples which arrived later — the Franks and Saxons — or had remained in Germany — the Alamanni, Bavarians, and Frisians — had continued to worship the Germanic divinities. Traces of this are still to be found in the English and German names for the days of the week (for instance, *Friday*, *Freitag*), which

had replaced the names of the Roman divinities. Out of opposition to the Arian kings the Roman bishops in Gaul came to an understanding with a pagan king of the Franks, Clovis, who was baptized. His Franks, who had settled among the Roman Christians, adopted their religion. But the ancient religion long remained that of the northern Franks and of all the peoples which had remained in Germany.

Religious unity, broken by the conflict between orthodox and Arian, was finally re-established in the lands of the ancient Empire when the Arian kings of the Visigoths in Spain and the Langobardi in Italy were converted and became orthodox, like their Roman subjects. In all lands subject to barbarian kings the bishops, as leaders of their Christian subjects, were treated by the king as great persons on an equality with counts. The clergy, feeling the need of a common authority, recognized the pope of Rome as superior to the other bishops; his decisions, known as *decrees*, began to be accepted as binding by all the churches of Europe.

Though the pope was still the subject of the emperor of Constantinople, he began to behave like an independent sovereign. At the end of the sixth century Pope Gregory I (known as "the Great"), a member of a great Roman family and the owner of great domains, used his resources to repair the walls of Rome and feed its inhabitants. He became their real leader. The conquest of the Christian lands of the East by the Moslems in the seventh century, by doing away with the sees of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, enhanced the dignity of the pope, who was recognized as the superior of all the bishops of the west.

Foundation of churches in the country districts

Up to the fifth century the Christian religion had been practised only in the towns. Christians were to be found in large numbers in lands having a number of towns, such as Italy and the south of Gaul, but were far fewer in the lands where towns were scarce, such as Spain, the rest of Gaul, and Great Britain. In lands with no towns there were none. From the fifth to the ninth centuries, by a very slow process carried on by the bishops and the monks at the same time, using a variety of methods, religion spread from the towns and permeated simultaneously the country population of the Empire and the barbarian peoples which had remained pagan.

The bishop established in each town was attached to it by a mystic bond and could not be transferred to any other. He was surrounded by a body of auxiliary clergy attached to the town. He began to send out priests into the territory of his *civitas* charged with celebrating worship, first in the country towns in which there were still some free men, and then on the great domains where the great landowner had founded an *oratory* (place of prayer) for his family, servants, and peasants. In delegating the priest for these functions the bishop at first reserved to himself the power of administering all the sacraments, even the Communion and baptism. The faithful of the whole territory were still bound to come to the town to celebrate the religious festivals and receive the sacraments. Later the priest received power to administer the sacraments, except those of confirmation and ordination of the clergy, which have continued to be reserved to the bishop up to the present day.

When the whole territory of the *civitas* was provided with priests, it was divided up, each priest having a part assigned to him, which, as early as the seventh century, took the Greek name of *parish*, the area over which the bishop's jurisdiction extended being called the *diocese*. Every parish had its church, to which was attached a domain, the produce of which served to support the priest and provide for the upkeep of worship. The church was consecrated to a saint, its *patron* saint, venerated by the faithful as a protector who was actually present. He healed the sick and averted calamities — epidemics, floods, and drought. The cult of the saint united the inhabitants of the parish in a mystical community, which was defended by an invisible head possessing supernatural power.

Religion had also been disseminated outside the towns by monks, who had settled in the country in order to flee from the world. Monastic life, which in the East had consisted mainly in ascetic practices and inactive contemplation, had undergone a transformation in order to adapt it to European sentiment. An Italian, St. Benedict, who was an abbot towards the end of the sixth century, had given his monks a *rule*, prescribing the exact use to which the hours of the day were to be put. It divided the time between religious exercises, prayers, sacred song, pious reading, and manual labour. The monks tilled the soil or practised a craft; they made the objects used in worship

and even copied manuscripts. The rule of St. Benedict was soon adopted by almost all monasteries in Europe, which adopted the name of *Benedictine*. Convents for women, directed by an abbess, were founded on the same model. These houses became a refuge for the faithful who found the society of their day too little in conformity with the Christian ideal. They were also centres in which a little of the civilization of antiquity was preserved. Every monastery, in addition to the monks' dwellings, had its farm buildings, barns, out-buildings, and workshops.

The reclamation of uncultivated lands through the agency of the monks seems to have been exaggerated by romantic historians. Almost all convents were founded on some great domain presented by a great landowner and settled with peasants who cultivated it. The position of the monks was mainly that of landlords. They did, however, live among the country people, and every convent had a church attended by the laity for purposes of worship, which became a centre of Christian propaganda among the surrounding population. The monastic churches served to complete the network of parishes which was gradually growing up over all the Christian lands.

Spread of Christianity

While the Christian religion was penetrating more deeply among the population of the lands officially subject to the authority of the Church, it was also spreading among the barbarian peoples outside the ancient Empire. Following the example of the Apostles, priests, or more often monks, went forth into the Germanic-speaking pagan lands and preached the religion of Christ. Some of them would address the crowds that had gathered for some celebration, sometimes even finding martyrdom there and coming to be numbered among the saints. But the most lasting successes were those obtained by a missionary who had enlisted the aid of a barbarian king, often through the intervention of his already Christian wife. He used arguments impressive to simple souls — the hope of being admitted to paradise or the fear of the torments of hell — and in order to demonstrate the powerlessness of the indigenous god he would destroy the idols. Once converted, the king would impose his religion upon his subjects by the same method as that followed by the emperor

within the Empire. He would order them to be baptized and forbid them to continue the practice of their former cult, on pain of very harsh punishments and even of death. The resistance of his subjects was active and lasted a long time among the peoples that had remained behind in Germania. Those of the north, the Saxons, were converted only by war and at the end of the eighth century.

The missionaries started out from two centres very widely separated from each other and in mutual conflict, and went in two different directions. From Ireland, where monastic life was very strict, ascetics went forth who, to mortify the flesh, left their native land and settled in the wildest and most desolate regions. Their virtue attracted disciples, who came and lived with them, and they sometimes converted the people of the land, as did St. Columban in France and a few saints in Germany (St. Gall, Kilian, and Fridolin); but they left no organized church behind them.

The only centre which had a lasting influence was Rome, whence the popes sent out missionaries who, in the seventh century, converted the barbarian peoples of Great Britain. They began their operations separately, starting at the two opposite extremities. In the south-east they started in the domains of the little Saxon King of Kent, whose wife was a Christian, and in the north in the domains of the King of Northumbria. It is in the domains of these two kings that the two most ancient bishoprics were founded, Canterbury in the extreme south and York in the extreme north, which became the two metropolitan sees between which the whole of England was divided up.

The Christian religion was gradually adopted by all the kings of the Angles and Saxons. The churches were organized according to the Roman rite, with the Roman liturgy in Latin. They recognized the pope not only as the supreme authority in matters of doctrine, but as the supreme judge to whom all the faithful might appeal in order to obtain the annulment of their bishops' decisions.

The Irish, who had become Christians without ever having been subjects of the Roman Empire, had retained a few usages of the Eastern Church differing from the Roman customs. Chief among these were the style of the tonsure and the mode of calculating Easter. They clung to these differences of form, which marked their independence of Rome. Their missionaries, who were sent out to the barbarian kings of the Angles and Saxons, met those of the pope and

Spread of Christianity

quarrelled with them. The barbarian kings decided in favour of the Romans.

The unity of religious authority first established in the Empire by the emperor, in virtue of his political authority, began to spread to the barbarian peoples, bringing with it the remnants of unity, in language, law, and civilization, preserved by the Roman clergy.

RESTORATION OF UNITY BY THE EMPIRE AND THE CHURCH

•

Disorganization of authority

The heads of the Church, being attached to the tradition of a single authority established by the Empire, sought to uphold this by obtaining submission to the authority of the Church with the assistance of the kings, who were the leaders in war. Up to the beginning of the eighth century, however, the general state of disorder in Europe did not permit the establishment of any lasting authority.

During the seventh century the rule of the Frankish kings had become disorganized. The Frankish military leaders no longer obeyed their king. The peoples of Germany, Alamanni, Bavarians, and Thuringi, had military leaders (called by the chroniclers *dukes*) who no longer obeyed the king of the Franks. In Gaul the Bretons, who had migrated to the land still bearing their name, lived quite independently and the whole territory between the Pyrenees and the Loire (known as Aquitaine) was under the dominance of a war leader who assumed the title of *duke* (and in the eighth century that of *king*). The Moslems, who at the beginning of the eighth century subdued the whole of Spain, occupied the region between the Pyrenees and the Rhône.

The lands which still did obedience to the Frankish kings had been partitioned into three regions, each of which passed to the same heir in its entirety when the sons of a king divided up his domains: Neustria, the land of the west, extending as far as the Loire; Austrasia, extending as far as the Rhine; and Burgundy in the east. The Frankish king had ceased to govern in person, and in each of these three

Restoration of Frankish authority

countries the real power was wielded by the chief of the king's servants, known in Latin as *major domus* (which historians later translated by "mayor of the palace"). But the warriors possessing great domains did not obey him properly. The disorder had spread even to the clergy. The bishops chosen by the king from among the great landowning families lived in the same style as their warlike relatives, wearing lay costume, waging war, and hunting. The priests no longer observed the discipline of the Church, but lived like laymen.

In Spain the Visigothic kings who had been converted to orthodoxy governed with the co-operation of the bishops, who met at Toledo, now the royal residence, in the assembly of the great ones of the realm, known as the "council." Inside his own diocese every bishop was the superior of the count, who was the king's delegate; he gave judgment in political and religious cases as well as in civil and criminal suits. But the Church in Spain, already virtually independent of the pope, was entirely cut off from Europe at the beginning of the eighth century by the Arab conquest. For five centuries Christians passed under the absolute dominion of Moslem sovereigns, and their churches remained isolated from the Christian churches.

Italy was parcelled up among several rulers. The Langobardi, who had occupied the northern region, had massacred most of the great landowners and taken their places. They stood apart from the old Roman population longer than the other barbarians. During the eighth century they began to become fused into a single people, which still bears the name of *Lombards*.

The coasts of the Adriatic and southern Italy still recognized as their sovereign the emperor of Constantinople, represented by a very high dignitary, the *exarch*, residing at Ravenna, and their ports continued to trade with Constantinople. After the conquest of Sicily by the Moslems, Greek refugees settled in southern Italy, where Greek became the language in current use. But when a new dynasty of emperors forbade the faithful to adore the images of the Virgin and saints, the Pope broke off relations with the Emperor and became the head of an independent State.

Restoration of Frankish authority

Royal authority and unity of command were restored in the eighth century by a succession of military leaders descended from a family

Conversion of the peoples of Germania

of great landowners in the neighbourhood of Metz, in Austrasia, where the Franks had preserved their language and customs most fully. These leaders, known to writers of that time as “dukes of the Franks,” had become hereditary *mayordomos* (mayors of the palace) in Austrasia, and had kept in close touch with the clergy.

The man who restored a united authority was Charles (long afterwards called *Martel*), *mayordomo* of Austrasia. He brought back into submission first the Franks of Neustria and then the peoples of Germania. He made war on the Moslems from Spain and expelled them from the south of Gaul. His son Pepin completed the reunion of all Gaul under a single rule. He conquered the chiefs who had assumed the title of king in Aquitaine and destroyed their families.

Conversion of the peoples of Germania

The conversion of the barbarian peoples, begun in England in the seventh century by missionaries sent by the Pope, was carried on in Germany in the eighth century by monks of barbarian nations (Angles and Saxons) already habituated to the Papal obedience. The most celebrated of these, Wynfrith, who took the Latin name of Boniface, first went to Rome to take an oath of obedience to the Pope and bound himself to administer the sacraments in the same form as the Roman Church. He next betook himself to Germania with the recommendation and under the protection of Charles, the ruler of the Franks. He found there peoples partially converted by monks from Ireland and came violently into conflict with the Irish, who were independent of Rome. Aided by the Duke of the Bavarians, he induced the Bavarians, Alamanni, and Thuringi, subjects of the King of the Franks, to accept religion in the Roman form. He then divided up the territory among bishops, who made submission to the Pope. The rule of the Church required that the bishop should be the head of the Christian community in a town. But since there were no towns in Germania, Boniface first established bishops in the ancient Roman towns on the frontier, which had been in ruins since the invasion — Utrecht, Cologne, Trier (Trèves), Mainz, Speyer (Spire), Worms — or else beside ancient Roman fortresses — at Basel, Constance, Ratisbon, Passau, Salzburg — and afterwards in the interior, near the recently founded abbeys. All the bishops were consecrated by the Pope and submitted to the rules of the Church of Rome. Thus religious unity

Political work of Charlemagne

was extended to most of the peoples of Germany, with centres of authority established near the frontiers of the Empire.

Alliance between the Frankish kings and the Pope

The two populations established within what had formerly been the Empire — the Romans still in submission to their bishops and the barbarians under the command of their warrior kings — were combined in a new unity by an alliance between the two principal authorities in the west, the Pope and the King of the Franks.¹

The King of the Lombards, as master of northern Italy, had seized some domains belonging to the Holy See. The popes had no armed forces at their disposal to stop him. One of them, a Greek from southern Italy, approached Pepin, a young prince of the Merovingian family who ruled over the Franks as majordomo, and asked for his assistance. Pepin desired to assume the title of King and sent to consult the Pope, who approved of his project. He then had himself proclaimed King and consecrated by some bishops. A new Pope next came to Gaul and, following the precedent of the Jewish kings, anointed Pepin, his sons, and his wife with consecrated oil. This is the origin of the religious ceremony of consecration (in French, *sacre*) customary at the accession of all kings of France and imitated by other kings. It gave the king a religious character which made him more worthy of respect in the eyes of his Christian subjects.

In return Pepin restored to the Pope the towns occupied by the Lombards. He recaptured them and handed them over to St. Peter, the founder and patron saint of the Church of Rome. Thus was created the territory known later as the "States of the Church," in which the Pope possessed the power of an independent sovereign. Such was the origin of the "*temporal power*," which, by forcing the popes to defend their State, was to hinder the establishment of political unity in Italy.

Political work of Charlemagne

The unification begun by Charles and Pepin was completed by Pepin's son Charles, known as the Great (in French, Charlemagne), whose name was transmitted to the *Carolingian* family. He spent

¹ This period is a little better known to us than the preceding centuries. We no longer draw our information merely from scanty chronicles, but from biographies, collections of letters from kings, popes, and bishops, and, above all, from the *Capitularies*, a collection of the acts of the Frankish kings (ordinances, projects, and instructions).

Restoration of the Empire

almost the whole of his reign on military expeditions, with an army which was probably not very large, for it consisted of horsemen, but which no other army of the day could withstand.

He first subdued the Lombards of Italy and assumed the title of "King of the Lombards," while allowing that people to retain its own customs and law. He occupied the territory of the Bavarians and deposed the Duke, who had been behaving like an independent sovereign. He destroyed a people of mounted nomads from Asia, the Avars, who had settled in the plain of the Theiss, and opened up to German settlers the land which was afterwards to be Austria. He crossed the Pyrenees and conquered the territory of Barcelona, afterwards Catalonia, in the north-east of Spain, where the customs of the Franks survived.

His longest and most troublesome war was waged against the Saxons settled between the Elbe and the Rhine, a warrior people very much attached to their customs and religion. Charlemagne meant to compel them to obey both the King of the Franks and the Christian Church. He destroyed their sanctuaries, prohibited the general assembly of the heads of their various cantons (*Gaue*), and ordered them to be baptized. He exacted from all free men an oath to remain faithful to the king and the Christian religion. The Saxons revolted several times, destroyed the churches, and massacred the priests. Charles treated them as traitors who had broken their oath and had them massacred, executed, and finally transported out of the land with their families, establishing Frankish settlers in their place. He founded bishoprics and abbeys in the land, which became centres of Frankish domination and Christian civilization. He allowed the Saxon people to retain their customs and private law, but placed them under the government of Frankish warriors and prelates.

Restoration of the Empire

Charlemagne had now united beneath his authority almost all the Christian lands on the Continent. The title of king seemed inadequate for such a powerful sovereign. There was no emperor in Constantinople at that moment, power having been usurped by a woman, so that the title seemed to be vacant. Charlemagne having gone to Rome to put down a revolt, Pope Leo crowned him and proclaimed him "Augustus." Charlemagne made no change in his mode of life; he

Charlemagne's government

continued to wear Frankish costume, speak the Frankish language, and reside on Frankish territory in his palace at Aix-la-Chapelle. But though adding nothing to his power, the ancient title of Emperor passed to his heirs and conferred upon them a dignity superior to that of kings. The clergy, which retained its respect for the Imperial authority, received the impression that unity had been restored in the West under a single sovereign, and even the Pope recognized himself to be the Emperor's subject.

Charlemagne's government

Charlemagne, like the ancient Roman emperors, possessed unlimited power. But his subjects were not in the habit of obeying an impersonal power wielded by officials in the name of an invisible sovereign. They understood none but personal relations and obeyed only orders given in person; nor could Charles himself conceive of any others. He tried to establish order in his Empire by uniting all forms of authority under his own personal direction. By ordering all free men to swear fidelity to him he wished to bind all his subjects to his person by a personal pledge.

Charles made the whole government centre upon his own person. All orders went forth from his private residence, known by the Latin name of *court* (the equivalent of the German *Hof*), meaning the house which is the centre of a great domain. He made his family, servants, and friends assist him in the work of government. Unlike the Romans, who made slaves perform personal services and regarded these as dishonouring, the barbarian warriors sought their ruler's service as an honour. The most important persons were the chief officers of his household. There were four at the court of Charlemagne, whose duty it was to provide for the maintenance of the throng of people living about the King's person: the *seneschal*, in charge of the table and meals; the *butler*, in charge of the cellars; the *constable* (*comes stabuli*), in charge of the horses for the escort; the *chamberlain*, in charge of clothing, supplies, and treasure. Their functions (in Latin, *officia*) are the origin of the "*great offices*" which came to be established at all the courts of Europe.

For writing, of which the clergy alone were capable, Charlemagne had a staff of scribes, called *notaries*. The chief of them, an ecclesiastic known by the Latin name of *chancellor*, supervised the drafting of

Charlemagne's government

royal acts and attached to them the royal seal in wax, which was the proof of their authenticity. This is the origin of the *chancellery*, which has become an institution common to the whole of Europe for all organs of authority. Charles maintained about his person a body of ecclesiastics known as his *shapel*, among whom he chose the bishops and abbots.

In deciding public affairs Charlemagne took counsel with his confidential advisers, known as *counsellors*. This is the origin of the *council* of government, an institution which became common to all the European princes. The assembly of free warriors, held, according to the custom of the Germanic peoples, in the open air, was still summoned in the month of May, but Charles confined himself to apprising it of the decisions at which he had arrived in his council.

Charlemagne employed the same methods for executing his orders as the barbarian kings. Every city, or, in the Germanic lands, every canton (*Gau*), was subject to a warrior bearing the title of count, charged with all business of concern to the king. It was the count's duty to assemble and command the warriors, maintain order, summon and preside over the court of justice, administer the king's domains, and collect his revenues.

To keep in touch with his subjects in that age when no regular means of communication or conveying information existed, Charlemagne made use of a custom which had been growing up slowly among the Franks during the last century. The owners of very great domains — military leaders, bishops, or abbots — had acquired the habit of maintaining an escort of armed horsemen in their service. The majority of fighting men were no longer free men equipping themselves and making war at their own expense in obedience to the king's orders. They were the servants of some great person, attached to him for life by a personal pledge and calling him by the Latin name *senior* (the old man), equivalent to the word *dominus*, signifying "master," his wife being called *domina*. He called them his *men*, or else by a name whose origin is a matter of controversy — *vassus*, meaning servant (of which *valet* is the diminutive). Charlemagne recognized the *senior* as an official intermediary between his "men" and the king, and ordered the lords (in French, *seigneurs*) to bring their men with them to the army, while leaving the lords the power of leading them. Adopting this custom on his own account, he re-

Power given to the clergy

quired every man in a position of authority to take a personal pledge to serve him as his *senior*. All great persons, dukes and counts, bishops and abbots, even the great landowners, became the king's *vassals*, and the king became the overlord of them all. This was the first beginning of the feudal system.

Power given to the clergy

For the purpose of governing his subjects Charlemagne desired to make the two kinds of established authority work together — that is, the material authority of the counts, as military leaders, and the religious authority of the bishops, as heads of the clergy. In his council he deliberated with them both jointly, and for inspecting the lands under his rule he sent a bishop and a count on circuit, known as “envoys of the master” (*missi dominici*), who worked in concert.

The two authorities were to render each other support. The count was to compel the king's subjects to obey the clergy by material force; the bishop was to compel the faithful to obey the count by the threat of spiritual penalties. Thus the king's material power of compulsion, in his capacity as military leader, was placed at the service of the religious leaders to make the faithful submissive to the orders of the Church, as well as to give effect to sentences pronounced by the clergy. In return the clergy placed its spiritual power of excommunication at the sovereign's service to compel the faithful to obey him. This is the origin of the system of collaboration, adopted by all governments, which lasted all over Europe down to the nineteenth century.

To secure the material subsistence of the clergy, Charlemagne laid down the rule that every church must possess a domain cultivated by peasants, the revenues of which were to provide for the priest's maintenance, and, following the model proposed to the Jewish people, he ordered all his subjects to pay the parish priest a tenth of their produce, crops and herds. This is the origin of the *tithe*, which has survived in Europe to a varying degree and has often been diverted from its original purpose.

Christian worship was fully established in all the lands subject to Charlemagne. The whole territory was divided up into *parishes*, in each of which was built a church served by a priest, who was entrusted with the cure (*cura*) of souls of the faithful, whence the terms *curate* and *curé* (the French for parish priest). He was bound to

supervise their conduct and compel them to perform their religious duties: attendance at public worship and Communion and observance of fasts and abstinence. The Church became the centre of the community. It had its *altar*, for the celebration of Mass and the Communion, its *baptismal font* for baptisms, its *cemetery*, in consecrated ground, for the burial of the dead, its bell-tower, commanding the church, from which the bells (the use of which had come from the East) summoned the faithful to services or prayer. Thus the church became the meeting-place of all inhabitants of the land on all occasions. In all Christian lands the *parish*, governed by the church, was to become the framework of public life in the country districts, the basic unit which was to keep all inhabitants attached to their native place by a sentiment of local patriotism. It was the origin of the modern *commune*, which in England still bears the name of *parish*.

Revival of learning

Education had sunk to such a low ebb in the lands subject to the King of the Franks that even the clergy were no longer able to read the sacred books, their writing was almost illegible, and their Latin had become barbarous. The tradition had been better preserved in a few convents in Ireland, England, and Italy. Charlemagne sent to these lands for men celebrated for their learning, whom he kept about his person. At his court and in the monasteries of his Empire they started a revival of the habit of reading Latin and writing it correctly, and even of prose and verse composition. This return to the study of Latin, known as the "Carolingian Renaissance," produced nothing but puerile and pretentious imitations of the Latin writers. But it started habits of great importance for public life. Writing, reformed by a return to antique forms, developed into the very legible Carolingian *minuscule* script, which served as a model for our printed characters. Correct Latin reappeared not only in the writings and letters of ecclesiastics, but also in the official acts of the Government and even in private deeds.

This renaissance saved the works of the Latin authors of antiquity, surviving only in manuscripts written on parchment, which had become extremely rare, and many of which had even been lost. Charlemagne had them sought out and copied, and, following his example, some monasteries acquired the habit of copying ancient manuscripts

and storing them in their libraries. Almost all the works of the Latin authors have been preserved for us in copies written from the ninth century onwards.

As part of the revival of learning Charlemagne had founded at his court a school in which were educated the young ecclesiastics of his *chapel* whom he intended to become bishops and abbots. The bishops had schools attached to their cathedral churches, the abbots founded them at a number of monasteries, and the subjects were taught in them which had been in vogue in the Latin schools at the end of the Empire: grammar and rhetoric, acquired by study of the Latin authors, especially those of the sixth century. Thus the clergy kept up the tradition of the bombastic and obscure Latin of the decadence, which was to vitiate the literary taste of the Christian world. But the teaching of Latin in all the clergy schools established unity of cultural language among all the peoples of the West. Latin, the language of religion and government, became that of the common civilization of Europe.

Starting at the court of Charlemagne, the renaissance spread very unequally. Its strongest effects were confined to the lands of the Franks to the north of the Loire and the bishoprics and monasteries in Germany. But in the Romance lands — Aquitaine to the south of the Loire, the region of the Rhône, Spain, and Italy — its effect was weak. A reversal took place in the part played by intellectual civilization in the various countries. The formerly barbarous part of Europe gained an advantage over the part which had once been more civilized. Latin was far better known and more correctly written in the originally barbarian lands; it was in the Roman lands that it remained most incorrect. For nearly five centuries it was in the northern lands, from the Loire to the Elbe, that there was the greatest zeal for education and that most chronicles were written and the greatest quantity of public and private deeds drawn up. This is why they are the richest in records and their history is the best known.

Dismemberment of the Empire

Charlemagne's Empire was a personal creation. His subjects had obeyed him because he gave his orders in person with commanding personal authority. But his territory was too large to be governed by a single individual. According to the custom of the Frankish kings,

Dismemberment of the Empire

Charlemagne himself had divided his Empire between his three sons, like a family domain. Unity was preserved because only one son, Louis, survived him and came in for the whole inheritance. He failed to make himself obeyed, and on his death his three sons, after fighting among themselves, divided the Empire among them by the Treaty of Verdun (843).

The title of Emperor, being indivisible, passed only to the eldest, the two others taking the title of King. Each received a share roughly identical with a region in which the same language was spoken, as is shown by the "Strasbourg oath," taken in 842 by the kings in the presence of their two armies, one in a Germanic tongue for the warriors of the east and the other in a Romance tongue for the warriors of the west. Louis took the Germanic-speaking lands to the east of the Rhine, and Charles the Romance-speaking lands to the west of the Meuse, Saône, and Rhône. Both were still called in the vulgar tongue by the same name of *Francia* (land of the Franks), but only the western kingdom still bears it. The other has taken the name of *Deutschland*, but foreigners have called it Germania (Germany), or else, as in France, the name of the people nearest to Italy and France, the Alamanni (French *Allemande*).

The Emperor Lothair received the kingdom of the Lombards and a tract lying between his two brothers' shares and made up of lands which had nothing in common with each other. Most of them spoke a Romance language, but the part bordering on the Rhine a Germanic language. This long, narrow territory between the Meuse, Saône, and Rhône on one side and the Rhine, Jura, and Alps on the other soon split up into a number of fragments. The southern one was called *Provence*, the central one *Burgundy*. The northern one, called *Lotharingia*, was divided into two fragments which became duchies, one continuing to bear the name of *Lorraine*, while the other was *Brabant*. This tract, in which no lasting form of rule came into being, was disputed between the neighbouring kings. For ten centuries it remained a scene of conflict and the battlefield between the two great kingdoms of France and Germany. In the end France was to acquire the greater part of it, Germany retaining only the region bordering on the Rhine. The rest went to make up Romance-speaking Switzerland, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

Unity survived only in the form of the religious authority be-

longing to the pope, the supreme head of the Church, whose power of annulling the bishop's judgments had come to be recognized in the ninth century.

Society

While authority was being re-established in part of Europe, society was being reorganized on a system which is not well known to us. We can only catch a glimpse of it through the medium of a few scanty records, fortuitously preserved, almost all of which are concerned with domains of the Church, and that only in the more civilized regions which made use of written documents: in France, Italy, and Germany.

In every land the predominant class was still composed of fighting men, who had force at their disposal, their station in life depending upon their mode of fighting. There were still peoples in Europe which continued to fight on foot: the Saxons, the Celts in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, the Scandinavians, the Slav peoples, and the Christian population in the mountains of Spain. These were the less civilized peoples, too poor to own an expensive equipment. In the most civilized lands the army henceforth consisted almost entirely of horsemen fighting with the lance and equipped with defensive armour, the "byrnie," a sort of tunic covered with iron rings; they had to equip themselves at their own expense, also providing transport, implements, and victuals.

This burden had become too much for the small landowners; some had been ruined by the enormous fine levied upon those who failed to respond to the summons to war. Others had renounced their status as landowners, handing over their land to some great landlord, who left them in possession of it, but only as tenants, and they ceased to be fighting men. Thus the number of fighting men owning their land had greatly diminished, especially in the north of France and the west of Germany. The only warriors left were the owners of the great domains called *seniores* and the vassals forming their escorts, equipped and maintained at their lord's expense and having no occupation save war.

In England, too, above the mass of ordinary free men (*ceorls*), called up only for purposes of defence, there had grown up a privileged class, the *eorls* (the name appears as early as the seventh cen-

ture), owning at least five parcels or *hides* of land, who were fighting men, for they were bound to provide themselves with armour and a helmet. There were also noble families among the Saxons in Germany.

Another predominant class was made up of ecclesiastics, known collectively by the name of "clerks." They wielded an effective authority, lived on the labour of the laity, and alone possessed the art of reading and writing. The bishops and abbots were great persons, owning enormous domains, in personal touch with the king, whose vassals they were, living the life of great lords, and surrounded by an escort of warriors. The monks lived in monasteries, each of which owned a great estate, and were subject to the rule of St. Benedict, which imposed upon them an existence cut off from what they called "*secular*" life (the life of the century or age) — that is, the world of the laity. The female religious, known as nuns, were enclosed in their convents and lived a similar life. The priests of every episcopal see led a life in common, subject to a rule which made the practice of pious exercises compulsory. They were called *canons*, from a Greek word meaning "rule." These communities of religious preserved the tradition of studying the Holy Scriptures, religious music, the knowledge of Latin and of the works of antiquity.

The priests alone exercised functions which brought them into constant personal contact with the laity. They celebrated public worship in the parish church, the essential act of which was the Mass. They administered the sacraments: baptism, to which was attributed a miraculous effect upon children's life; marriage; and extreme unction, administered to the dying. They heard confessions and granted absolution, though we do not know whether the practice of confession was frequent. They were bound to supervise the conduct of the faithful so as to compel them to obey the commands of the Church (see Chapter IV). The prohibited acts are enumerated in the *penitentials* (books of penance), disseminated throughout Europe in the ninth century. They were: murder, perjury, theft, sexual offences, Sunday labour, marriage between relatives within the prohibited degrees (even between cousins), and a number of pagan practices, specified in an "Index of Superstitions" drawn up for Germany. The penalty attaching to these offences was penance, which was no longer performed in public, as in the East. To adapt it to barbarian ways, the

Church had made it secret. It consisted chiefly in fasting, abstinence, prayers, and almsgiving. There are no records telling us how the people really practised their religion. Most of the priests had had no means of obtaining an education and must have been incompetent to direct the faithful.

Warriors and ecclesiastics formed the privileged classes, which owned all wealth and wielded all authority. The mass of the population lived on a very inferior plane, abandoned defenceless to the power of the warriors and clerks. Merchants and artisans rarely appear in the records. They cannot have been either numerous or prosperous, for the towns, which were very small and poor, only managed to subsist because they were the residence of some rich and powerful person, a duke, count, bishop, or abbot. Trade was confined to a few luxuries from the East, and from the eighth century onward was almost put an end to by the Moslem pirates who had established themselves in the Mediterranean and stopped communications by sea. Most industrial labour was performed for the great landowners by their servants, whether free or slaves — bakers, butchers, brewers, blacksmiths, armourers, or bootmakers, working on premises attached to their master's dwelling. Linen or woollen yarn, stuffs, and clothing had to be supplied as dues by the peasants or their wives. The work of building and road-making was carried out by forced labour furnished by the tenants.

Almost the whole population was still employed in field-labour, in tilling the soil and breeding beasts, which produced the necessities of life: food, wool, and leather. It was made up of peasants living on the land. All the surviving records refer to the great domains and fail to inform us what proportion of the peasants consisted of small landowners. Most of the land was united in very great domains (as large as a French commune) cultivated by tenants who merely held their lands subject to the obligatory payment of dues and providing labour for the benefit of the great landowner. Their status before the law varied, some being free-born *coloni* and others *serfs*, the descendants or successors of former slaves, subject to heavier dues than the free tenants.

Agrarian system

Methods of cultivation varied as the result of two factors: the nature of the soil and the system of property established by law or custom. In the south, where the arable land consists of a thin layer which is soon exhausted, where the ill-watered pastures are scanty, and where, moreover, Roman law gave the landowner absolute power to dispose of his property, the labourer ploughed with the Roman wheelless *aratrum* (French, *araire*) drawn by one beast or by a pair of oxen, the ploughshare cutting only a little way into the ground. The shape and size of the field and the method of cultivation were decided at the landowner's will, and he had no need to take his neighbours into account, so that the parcels of land were of varying shape and size. The layer of humus being thin, the custom had prevailed from antiquity of sowing wheat only every other year, leaving half the land ploughed but uncropped. This system was known as "biennial rotation of crops." Furthermore, there were some uncultivated lands used as pasturage and occasionally brought back under cultivation.

In the northern countries, where the arable land was deeper and less rapidly exhausted, and where, moreover, the landowner possessed only a limited right, regulated by custom, the wheeled plough was used, with a stronger ploughshare, which turned up the earth to a greater depth and yielded a more abundant crop. For ploughing this heavy land it was necessary to have several pairs of oxen, usually four, and since each tenant possessed only one, they had to combine the teams belonging to several families. It was customary to distribute the crops over three years: in the first year autumn-sown wheat, in the second year the inferior kinds of cereals — barley, oats or rye, sown in the spring — in the third year the land was ploughed but uncropped. This was the "triennial rotation of crops."

Work was carried out according to rules common to a whole village, and the territory of the village was divided up into a number of lots, each of which had to be cultivated on a uniform plan in the same year. Each family cultivated a number of pieces of about the same value, consisting not of a field belonging to a single tenant, but of a large number of parcels (from twenty to thirty) scattered over the different lots of the village land. Each parcel was oblong in shape, the length being that of the furrow up to the point where the

team had to turn. The *acre*, which is still the measure of area in English-speaking lands, is a piece 218.72 yards long and 21.87 yards broad. Each strip, separated from the neighbouring ones by a ridge, had a path along its shorter side by which access was obtained to it. There was no other land besides, except grasslands, vineyards, and vegetable gardens.

All the strips in the same lot had to be under the same crop at the same time, whether winter or spring wheat, or else it had to lie fallow. After the crop had been got in, all the fields, as well as the parcels lying fallow, had to be thrown open. All fences were now forbidden, and all tenants in the village had the right to pasture their beasts there, for the natural meadows would not have sufficed to feed them.

This system, known in English as the "open field" system and in German as *Feldgemeinge* (mixture of fields), was common to northern France, England, and almost the whole of Germany and spread to the whole of eastern Europe as far as Russia. Traces of it are still to be seen in the shape of the fields. It was never applied either in the Romanized lands of the Empire or in the far west of Europe, in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, or the regions in France known as *bocage* (English, *boscage*). There are no records from which we may discover its origin, which remains a puzzle. It was evidently calculated with a view to preserving equal conditions for all tenants by giving them lands of the same value; yet it was not established by the great landowners on behalf of their tenants, for it has always been unknown in the great domains of the Roman lands. It occurs mainly in the barbarian lands, where the right of the landowner was limited by custom, and even on the great domains in England and Germany during the Middle Ages the portion belonging to the great landlord was made up of parcels similar to those of the ordinary tenants. It may therefore be supposed that the system must have been created by a community of owners of equal rank, capable of co-operating in agricultural labour, such as existed among the barbarian peoples.

By the ninth century the greater part of the lands, at least in the more civilized regions, was concentrated into very large domains, known in Latin as *villa* (the equivalent of the German *Hof*), in Italian as *massa*. Their organization is known to us only from very scanty records — in fact, from only one complete specimen, the register of lands belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in 819. The

greater part of the domain is divided into units of cultivation known in Latin as *mansus* (the equivalent of the German *Hufe* and the English *hide*). Each of these was owned by a family and included a house with garden, meadowland, and a number of parcels of arable land. With this went the right to graze cattle on the vacant lands and gather wood in the forest. One portion of the land, known in Latin as *indominicata* (belonging to the master), was reserved for the owner of the domain, who had it cultivated by his servants, assisted by labour due from the tenants. Every family of tenants owed the landowner dues payable chiefly in kind: cereals, pigs, hens, eggs, linen, or hemp; payments in money amounted to no more than a few coins. The family was also liable for labour on the land reserved to the master — haymaking, mowing, harvesting, threshing, and getting in the crops, hedging and ditching, carting his loads, and carrying his messages. We do not know exactly in what parts of Europe this system was in force, or what proportion of free men there was among the rural population.¹

¹ For the conditions of material life, see the end of Chapter VI.

CHAPTER SIX

ORIGINS OF THE FEUDAL SYSTEM AND FORMATION OF THE NATIONS (NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURIES)



Evolution of Europe between the ninth and eleventh centuries

The unity re-established in the most populous part of Europe during the eighth century through the understanding between the political authority of the emperor and the religious authority was broken up in the middle of the ninth century and the Empire of Charlemagne was partitioned among a number of kings. Authority was split up and became enfeebled.

At the same time in the vast and still very sparsely populated regions of eastern and northern Europe, which remained independent of the Empire and the Church, the barbarian population, hitherto divided into small tribes, drew together into groups tending to become nations, under the political authority of a military leader bearing a title equivalent to that of king and under the religious authority of the head of the Christian Church. Thus from the ninth to the eleventh century the two halves of Europe were undergoing a transformation in opposite directions. The more civilized lands were passing from unity to disruption, while the more barbarous peoples dispersed in tribes were beginning to draw together into nations.

We know very little about the history of this change. The records

show little more than isolated local facts, from which we cannot arrive at any general survey comparable to the picture provided by the Capitularies. Almost all of them are concerned with the lands between the Loire and the Elbe. In the tenth century, indeed, the evidence about what was happening in Germany, northern Italy, and England becomes even more abundant. But our information about the new Scandinavian and Slav peoples of eastern Europe is scarce and very superficial, coming not from records written by natives of the country in their own language, but from narratives written in Latin by foreigners, who were ecclesiastics and were almost always hostile to them.

The new invasions

The crisis caused by the dismemberment of the Empire was aggravated by fresh barbarian invasions. These were no longer, as in the fifth century, migrations of peoples who entered the invaded land with the object of settling in it, but incursions of armed bands for the purpose of pillaging the land and carrying off their booty. The invaders came from three extremities of Europe and belonged to different races, but all practised religions alien to Christianity and therefore had no respect for persons or property belonging to the Christian Church. They attacked for preference the churches in the towns or the monasteries, where for centuries past gold and silver had been amassed in the form of treasure, ornaments, reliquaries, and chalices. They desecrated the holy places and sacred objects, burned the churches, and massacred priests, monks, and nuns.

From the north-east — Denmark and Norway — came those known as the “Northmen” (in French, *Normands*), who fought on foot with the battle-axe and sword, their bands being led by a chief belonging to a great family, often called a “sea-king.” They came in boats with from twenty to forty rowers, usually propelled by oars, but having a sail, which was used only when the wind was favourable; and they combined to form a fleet. The Danes came coasting along the shores of the North Sea and carried on their operations chiefly in Germany, France, and England. The Norwegians crossed the North Sea to Scotland and Ireland, and even peopled the Faeroe Islands and Iceland. The Swedes went in the direction of Russia and Constantinople.

Their incursions went on for more than a century after the first one, in 793, which destroyed the great English monastery of Lindisfarne. At first they were expeditions from which the warriors returned to their own country every year. Next they settled with their families for good, either in the interior of the country, as in England and Ireland, or, as in France, in an entrenched camp near the mouth of a river, up which they advanced in their boats, pillaging the banks or exacting from the inhabitants of the country a ransom paid in gold or silver, measured by weight. They ravaged and held to ransom the whole of the Atlantic coast and the river-banks from Holland to Cadiz, in Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Spain. A few bands even entered the Mediterranean and pushed on as far as the coasts of Italy.

In some countries the "Northmen" settled for good, becoming fused with the inhabitants and modifying the character of the population. In these a fairly high proportion of persons of the Nordic type has remained — tall, with blue eyes and fair hair. Their principal settlement was in the north of England, where the Danes occupied the region known after them as the *Danelagh*, where they established a system of tenure and territorial divisions of their own. There was a pause in their incursions at the end of the ninth century, but they started again in the second half of the tenth. There was even a time, in the eleventh century, when all England was subject to a Christian Danish king living in Denmark. The Norwegians peopled the islands to the north of Scotland and the north-east coast of Ireland. In France the leader of the band settled on the Seine, Rollo, whose residence was at Rouen, having become a Christian and a vassal of the King, established a strong authority over his territory. The Normans adopted the language and religion of the inhabitants of the land, but brought with them some of their customs, and, above all, their spirit of enterprise, which worked a transformation in this hitherto obscure region.

From the south came the "Saracens," a name first applied to the Arabs, and given by the Christians to Moslems of various races. They occupied Sicily, Calabria, and Sardinia and even had fortified positions on the Adriatic and in Provence. They carried on their operations on the shores of the Mediterranean, especially in Italy, landing on the coasts, pillaging the countryside, and carrying off the

Effects of the invasions

inhabitants, whom they sold as slaves. They left no lasting traces behind them, except in Sicily.

From the east came the invasion of the Hungarians, nomads of Asiatic origin, speaking a language that belongs to the same family as Finnish. They came into Europe by way of southern Russia and up the Danube valley. Mounted upon very sturdy little horses capable of travelling long stages at a time, they fought with bow and arrows, using surprise tactics. They burned the villages and massacred the inhabitants or carried them off as slaves.

They began in the ninth century by destroying the new Slav kingdom of the Moravians, after which they devastated Bavaria, where not a single convent survived them. In the tenth century they pushed on in one direction as far as Italy and in the other direction across Germany and France as far as Toulouse. Towards the end of the tenth century, after making a desert of the Danube valley, they ended by settling down for good on the plains of the Theiss and Danube, where they became Christians, retaining their own language (Magyar), and formed an aristocracy of mounted warriors, supported by an agricultural population.

Effects of the invasions

If such small bands as these succeeded in making their way into the very heart of every country and ravaging it for more than a century, this was because the peoples of Europe were not at that time organized for defence. The fighting men were incapable of combining in a troop strong enough to check the progress of an invading band. The country lay open, with no fortifications; the towns, which were all very small, had only very weak walls, poorly defended. The invasions had as their immediate effect the still further enfeeblement of Europe, destroying the monasteries, ruining the towns, carrying off gold and silver, and reducing the population.

The period of the invasions was one of terror, confusion, and misery for Europe. No large towns were left, and Rome remained no more than a heap of ruined buildings. All civilized life was then to be found in the Moslem Arab Empire and the schismatic Byzantine Empire, where Arabs, Greeks, and Jews kept up the study of the sciences and arts of Greek antiquity. The centres of civilization were two great cities, at opposite ends of Europe: In the east Con-

Disintegration of authority in the Empire

stantinople, the residence of the emperor and patriarch, where Europeans wondered at the palaces, the great open spaces, the magnificent Church of St. Sophia, and the enormous walls. In the west, in Moslem Spain, was Córdoba, the residence of the Arab caliph, which in the tenth century, according to travellers' tales, probably had half a million inhabitants, six hundred mosques and twenty-one suburbs — figures which, though absurd, give an impression of its magnitude.

Indirectly the invasions produced a lasting effect, by terrorizing the inhabitants of Europe to such an extent that they decided to shelter themselves behind fortifications. In England, and later in Germany, the king had fortresses constructed, in which he installed a garrison of warriors, maintained by the population. In the lands of the old Empire the lords owning great domains transformed their residences into fortresses. At first these were no more than a wooden tower erected upon rising ground, defended by a palisade outside which was a fosse. From the eleventh century onward they were great stone buildings, surrounded by a ring of walls with square towers, built either on a sheer bluff or on an artificial mound of earth and defended by a broad, deep moat. The fortress could be entered only by crossing the moat on a drawbridge (*pont-levis*), which could be raised, and passing through a fortified gate. It was called in Latin *castellum* (small fortified place), in the Romance languages *castel* or *château*, and in the Germanic tongues *Burg*.

Disintegration of authority in the Empire

Unity of obedience had been maintained under the Frankish kings only by means of an army of horsemen equipped and making war at their own expense. By the time the king had completely ruined himself by distributing his domains to the army leaders in order to keep them in his service, the army had broken up into small bands, each led by a local chief. Though officially the king's lieutenants and vassals, the leaders in war, dukes and counts, ceased to obey him, each of them behaving like an independent sovereign on his own territory. Up to the end of the eleventh century their titles remained purely personal and unconnected with any province. But they acquired the habit of handing down their powers and titles to their sons, and the king was no longer strong enough to take them back again. Moreover, in every province the lords owning great estates and sur-

rounded by their vassal warriors did not obey the count any more than he did the king. They became even more independent during the eleventh century, when each of them had his own stronghold in which he could entrench himself. By that time the territory of what had once been the Empire was divided up into a very large number of very small centres, in which the authority belonged to him who possessed a great domain, a castle, and a troop of warriors. As the army had split up into small bands, each under the command of a local leader, war was broken up into thousands of little wars between bands, and it became an established custom that any warrior had the right to make war on any other.

Simultaneously with the army, political power was breaking up. As early as the ninth century this was taking place on the territories of the king of the Franks, the king of the Lombards, and the kings between whom the heritage of Lothair had been partitioned.

In France the title of King was disputed for a century (887–987) between the descendants of Charlemagne and the heads of a family descended from a Count Robert who had been in command in Anjou. His son Odo, who had defended Paris against the Normans, was recognized as king. His descendants ultimately kept this title permanently and founded what was later known as the “Capetian dynasty.” But though all the dukes and counts continued to recognize him as their overlord and take the oath as his vassals, and though his name appeared in official acts throughout the whole kingdom, the king was no longer obeyed outside his own personal domain, which was then very small. In order to ensure that his son should succeed him, he had him recognized as king and solemnly consecrated during his own lifetime. The chief armed force consisted of the escorts of warriors belonging to a few bishops who had remained faithful to their duty towards the king.

In Italy the title of King of the Lombards was contended for by a few great lords, and ultimately assumed by the king of the Germans, but he only actually enforced his sway while he was present in Italy with his army. Most of the towns were beginning to be governed by their notables, and the countryside by the great landowning lords, some of them with the titles of duke, marquis, or count. Those in the north recognized themselves to be the Emperor’s vassals. The pope was no longer obeyed in the territory which he governed as

Dismemberment of Spain

the successor of St. Peter. Southern Italy, which was nominally still a province of the Byzantine emperor, was, as a matter of fact, divided up between the towns and the local lords who had become independent.

The former heritage of Lothair in southern France, later known as the kingdom of Arles, where after the ninth century the title of King was borne only by princes without any power, was cut up into a large number of local lordships in which the power was exercised by dukes, counts, prelates, and a number of lords having no titles. The King of the Germans was nominally recognized as king in 1034, but never exerted any real power there.

Dismemberment of Spain

Spain had undergone vicissitudes which made it different from all the other countries in Europe. As early as the beginning of the eighth century an invasion by Moslems from Africa had founded a great kingdom there under an Arab ruler possessing both a religious and a military character. The caliph had his residence at Córdoba, in the south of Spain. All power was exercised exclusively by the Moslems, but, by submitting to the taxes exacted from their subjects by the Moslems, the Christian population had preserved its religion. Its bishops, who were recognized as the heads of the Christian communities, ceased to maintain relations with the pope and adopted a special liturgy of their own (known as the Mozarabic Rite). The Christians who were converted to Islam adopted the customs, language, and costume of the Moslems.

The army which had subdued Spain was composed of two war-like peoples: the Arabs, from Asia, settled in the most fertile region in the south; the Berbers, from Africa, who had penetrated even as far as the mountains of the north-east. All the lands subject to the Moslems were governed by military commanders known as *emirs*; justice was administered by judges (*cadis*) having both a civil and a religious character. Under this Moslem domination Spain developed an alien civilization which cut it off from Europe.

In the mountains of the extreme north, which were difficult of access, a few Christian war leaders had preserved their independence. To the north-west, in the Asturias, a ruler claiming descent from a Visigoth chief named Pelayo, known only from legendary tradition, had assumed the title of King. His successors first occupied the al-

Concentration of power in England

most uninhabited lands known to antiquity as Galicia and León, and afterwards a region known by the new name of Castile (land of the Castles). To the north-east, in the Pyrenees, the small Christian people of the Basques had always maintained its independence. A small Christian Romance-speaking centre was founded in the upland valleys, first at Jaca and afterwards at Pampeluna, where, towards the end of the ninth century, the ruler assumed the title of King. Such was the origin of Navarre, which afterwards increased its territories. The region conquered by Charlemagne on the Mediterranean coast remained under the domination of the king of France, being governed by a count who ultimately established his residence at Barcelona. Such was the origin of Catalonia, whose inhabitants, known as Catalans, preserved a language and customs of their own which gave them a sense of forming a distinct people.

When a king had several sons, he divided his territory among them and each of them assumed the title of King. Thus Christian Spain was parcelled out among a number of dominations, the extent of which varied according to the vicissitudes of the royal families. These kings' dominions — Asturias, León, Castile, Portugal, Navarre, Aragon — were sometimes smaller than the domain of a Frankish duke or count.

The land remained very poor and almost barbarous, though, since the eleventh century, the sanctuary of St. James of Compostella had attracted a great number of foreign pilgrims. The fighting men, not possessing sufficient means to keep up a full equipment, formed only a light cavalry, perhaps even an infantry force, and many of them entered the service of a Moslem chief.

Concentration of power in England

While the public authority was breaking up and growing weaker in the lands of the former Empire, in the barbarian countries it was becoming concentrated and strengthened. This process went on slowly for two centuries (from the ninth to the eleventh) by methods which differed among the peoples in England and Germany, which had remained Christian, from those prevailing among the peoples in the barbarous Europe of the north and east, which had remained pagan.

For four centuries the Germanic peoples of England had been

Unification of the peoples of Germany

divided up among four Saxon and three Anglian kings. The king of Wessex, having subdued the Celtic population of the south-west, had become the most powerful of them. It was Alfred, a king of Wessex, who delivered his land from the Danish invaders towards the end of the ninth century and united beneath his sway all the territories of the Saxon kings and a large part of that of the Angles.

Alfred carried out on a small scale what Charlemagne had done on a large one. He organized an armed force by compelling the owners of great estates to perform service in war and equip themselves at their own expense with a defensive armour reinforced with metal. He had strongholds built, known as *burhs*, and garrisoned with a small number of warriors, each of which became the chief town of a district bearing its name, known as a *shire*. This is the origin of the division of England into *counties*, which was first established in the centre and afterwards extended to the whole of England.

Alfred was a zealous Christian and started a small revival of learning. He used part of his revenue for founding monasteries and set up a school for teaching the sons of important people to read and write. He even attempted to train a clergy capable of reading Latin, and had some Latin books translated into the Saxon tongue. He maintained artisans who were employed in building churches, illuminating manuscripts, and making jewels.

The kings of his family who succeeded him maintained their power and even, for a time, won back the territory occupied by the Danes. But his later descendants, after 978, were too weak to prevent the Danes from returning to subdue the land, and for a few years a Dane named Canute reigned over both Denmark and England simultaneously. He was a Christian, however, and England, having regained its independence, remained united under a single king of Saxon descent, Edward, elected by the assembly of great persons.

Unification of the peoples of Germany

The German-speaking population was divided up into a small number of groups called by a German name, *Stamm*, each retaining its own customs, private law, and dialects and recognizing the authority of a war leader called in German *Herzog* (translated by *duke*).

Unification of the peoples of Germany

After the people of the Thuringi had been destroyed by its neighbours in the sixth century, only five peoples remained. In the south-west, on the Necker and as far as the bend of the Rhine, dwelt the Alamanni, known nowadays as the Swabians. They were separated by the Lech from the Bavarians, who had settled to the south-east on the Danubian plateau and were beginning to spread into the Alps and subdue the Slovenes. To the north-west the Frisians occupied all the North Sea coasts. The region of the north-east, between the Rhine and the Elbe, belonged to the Saxons. All the rest of the territory was subject to the most powerful people of all, the Franks, who had established themselves between the Rhine and the Meuse and in the region of the Main, which they had wrested from the Alamanni.

All the peoples of Germany recognized a single king, at first chosen from among the family of Charlemagne. After this became extinct in 911, the great ones of the land, prelates and leaders in war, met together and recognized one of the dukes as king. For a century after 918 this was the duke of the Saxons. Henry, the first of them, defended the land against the Hungarians. His son Otto drove them back once and for all and replaced the dukes of the various peoples by men devoted to himself. In matters concerning government he took counsel with the bishops and abbots, high officials nominated by the king, owning the great domains of the Church and enjoying the powers of a count, and led them out to war, in which they served with their escorts of horsemen.

He disposed of an army of mounted warriors and led them down into Italy, where the local rulers were no longer doing obedience to any king. He had himself recognized as King of the Lombards, and afterwards as Emperor at Rome. This became a custom which lasted up to the end of the Middle Ages and was the origin of what was afterwards called the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." Every king of the Germans had the right to become emperor and king of the Lombards, but he was bound to go to Italy to obtain recognition there. He summoned the "Roman expedition," in which all fighting men who were subjects of the king were obliged to take part, and set out with his army to assume the crown of the Lombards at Monza, near Pavia, after which he had himself crowned Emperor in Rome by the pope.

Up to the fourteenth century the German king, having become

The Scandinavian peoples

emperor, was the person enjoying the highest dignity. He gradually induced the rulers of the neighbouring countries to recognize him as sovereign; in the tenth century those of the former territory of Lothair between the Rhine and the Meuse, and later, in the eleventh century, those of the French-speaking lands from Switzerland to the Mediterranean, which had become nominally united under a single king who died without heirs in 1034. The most powerful of the emperors, Henry III, had himself recognized as suzerain by the rulers of the Slav nations of Bohemia, and even of Poland.

His nominal domination over so vast a territory gave the emperor great prestige, but the princes, and even the lords who were his subjects, often continued to behave like independent rulers. In order to secure obedience, even from the Germans, the emperor had to appear in person with his army. He had no fixed residence and passed a great deal of his time in travelling through the lands under his rule in order to force the rebellious to submit.

The Scandinavian peoples

Scandinavia, whence the most energetic of the barbarian peoples had gone forth, was and still remains the region with the highest proportion of men of the *Nordic* type, tall, with blue eyes and fair hair. By the ninth century there were three peoples still remaining there. The most numerous, the Danish people, occupied the extreme south of the peninsula, which belonged to Denmark up to 1658 under the name of Scania; it had spread to the islands and ultimately to Jutland. It was the first to become united, at the beginning of the ninth century, under a single ruler who assumed the Germanic title of *Konung* (King). Later the tribes scattered along the mountainous Atlantic coast in the west became united under a family of kings, founded, according to tradition, by Harald Haarfager (of the fair hair) in 872; they are known by a name meaning "men of the north" — in English, Norwegians. It is from these two peoples that the warlike seamen known as *vikings* went forth, who ravaged Europe and modified the character of the population in the north-east of England and on the coasts of Ireland and Normandy.

The great region between the high mountains and the Baltic belonged in part to a people known as *Sves* (Swedes), who were established in the centre. The south, from which the Goths had gone forth,

The Slav peoples

still bore the name of Gotland. It possessed a common pagan sanctuary at Upsala, but it was only in the eleventh century that Olaf, who was at once hereditary high priest of Upsala and the successor of a family of national rulers, assumed the title of King, wielding power only by consent of the assembly of the people.

Till after the middle of the tenth century the leaders of bands, or “sea-kings,” who had returned from pillaging expeditions, had almost destroyed the authority of the Scandinavian kings, who were the leaders in war and dispensers of justice. And even later their power did not become definitely hereditary, but depended upon their own personal energy.

The Slav peoples

The Slav-speaking tribes scattered over an immense area from the Elbe to Asia and the Black Sea became concentrated into peoples, each occupying a permanent territory, under war leaders who assumed a title in imitation of the Germanic king, *knez* (translated in Latin as *rex* or *regulus*).

Southern Slavs. The southern Slavs settled down in the land formerly known as Illyria and the lower Danubian plains, a deserted region the population of which had been exterminated, perhaps by the Slavs, for the place-names there are all Slavonic. They overflowed into the region of the Alps and as far as the Adriatic, till at last they formed three nations.

To the east, on the lower Danube, seven tribes banded themselves together in opposition to a mounted people, the Khazars, under the ruler of a people of yellow race from Asia, the *Bulgarians*, and formed a single people, which took their king's name while retaining the Slav language and customs. As early as the ninth century the royal family had become Slavized. The king, who was often at war with Constantinople, extended his sway, and in the tenth century assumed the title of *Tsar* (*Cæsar*) — that is, Emperor. Macedonia, which had become a Slav land as early as the ninth century, since it was known as *Slavinia*, remained a bone of contention between its two neighbours, the Bulgarians and the Serbs.

In the centre, the mountain region extending as far as the valley of the Save had been occupied by warlike tribes which retained the old Slav name of *Serbs* and were split up among a number of local chiefs

The Slav peoples

known as *zupans*. In the eleventh century they were at last united under a single ruler, the "great zupan." Such was the origin of the Serb nation. The northern region, subject to the Serb leaders, and afterwards to the Croat king, became a small independent state under the name of Bosnia.

In the west the tribes known as *Croats* (mountaineers), who had settled between the Alps and the Adriatic, had been subdued first by the mounted Avars and later by the Frankish kings, and formed a combative people divided among fourteen rulers (*zupans*) who became united under a king at the end of the eleventh century.

As early as the time of Charlemagne the Slavs had penetrated westward across the Alps as far as Venetia, where they survived under the names of Slovenes and Wends, divided into small tribes which were never united under a common head. They gradually passed under the domination of foreign rulers, chiefly Germans, who organized their land into frontier provinces of the Empire (Styria, Carinthia, and Friuli).

Western Slavs. The fate of the Slavs in the north-west, who had occupied the region abandoned by the Germanic peoples between the Elbe and the Vistula, varied according to their relations with the Germans. The tribes bordering upon Germany formed only small peoples, the chiefs of which are called "kinglets" (*reguli*) by the chroniclers. Those bordering on the Baltic, having become Christians and allies of the German kings, were ultimately Germanized, and their rulers became the German princes of Mecklenburg and Pomerania, the Slav name of which means "near the sea." The population spoke German, with the exception of the Kashubes (Kassubians), on the banks of the Vistula, who retained their Slav tongue. The peoples settled on the banks of the Saale, known by the same name as the Serbs (Sorbs or Sorabi), were united as early as 806 under a single prince, and subdued and Germanized by the German counts of the marches (*margraves*); they formed the population of the mark of Misnia (Meissen), which afterwards became the kingdom of Saxony. Part of them were driven back into the region known by the Slav name of *Lusatia*, and a small group of Slav-speaking "Wends" has even survived at the sources of the Spree. The peoples on the right bank of the Elbe, known as *Polabs* (those near the Elbe), resisted conversion and conquest by the Germans for more than two centuries; their forti-

The Slav peoples

fied town of Retra was not taken till 1068. They were finally exterminated or reduced to servitude by the German settlers, and the land became Germanized, the Slav name of their town Branibor having survived in the name Brandenburg.

The Slav tribes established farther to the south on both banks of the Danube began to form a nation as early as the ninth century, under a king who was master of a vast territory to which the name of Great Moravia has been given, and which was cut in two by the invasion of the Hungarians. Most of the people remained in subjection to the Hungarian warriors, whose language they adopted. The portion settled in the mountains to the north fell under the domination of the Hungarian kings, while retaining its name of *Slovaks* and its Slav language. The fragment in the west, which remained independent, kept the name of Moravians and was ultimately united to the Slav land of Bohemia.

Only two groups formed an independent Slav-speaking nation. In the region of the upper Elbe, surrounded by mountains, which continued to bear the German name of Bohemia (land of the Boii), was formed the Slav people of the Czechs, who were united in the ninth century under rulers known as *dukes*. The Duke of Prague extended his power over the whole of Bohemia, afterwards, in 950, recognizing himself as the vassal of the king of the Germans. The dukes, who were henceforth nominally dependent upon the kings of the Germans, did not assume the title of King till the twelfth century.

In the great plain of the Oder and the Wartha during the tenth century there came into being under a single ruler a Slav-speaking nation which is referred to simply by the geographical designation of *Poloni* (men of the plains), the name *Liakh* or *Lech* being given it only by foreigners. Their ruler, having become a Christian and assumed the title of King, had his residence first at Poznań (Posen), in the western region which continued to bear the name of Great Poland. In the eleventh century he extended his dominion over a very extensive territory, first over the region of Cracow on the upper Vistula, which was known as Little Poland, and later over the course of the Vistula.

The Russians. The eastern Slav tribes, which had remained scattered over an immense and almost uninhabited territory covered with forests and marshes, were united by foreigners coming across the sea from Sweden, and known as *Ros*. These were Scandinavians, fighting

Different kinds of authority

on foot with the battle-axe, who were both warriors and merchants. On the way from the Baltic to the Black Sea they founded towns which served as both garrisons and markets: in the north Novgorod, and in the south Kiev, which became the king's residence in the tenth century. Taking to their boats, their bands descended the Dnieper and even crossed the Black Sea, travelling as far as Constantinople, where a few of them entered the service of the Emperor and formed his bodyguard.

The Scandinavian name *Ros* was gradually extended to include all the eastern Slav peoples. But differences of customs and language grew up within this vast territory, till at last three groups were formed, corresponding to their dialects: in the west the *White Russians*, having the Poles as their neighbours; in the south *Little Russia* in the fertile plain round Kiev; and in the north *Great Russia*, which gradually increased its area as the Russians made their way into the forest region of the far north, where they absorbed the Finnish population, speaking an Asiatic language, which adopted the Slav customs and language of the Russians.

Different kinds of authority

In those days authority in Europe was wielded by virtue of two different kinds of right. As in the ancient *civitates* and among the barbarian peoples, the public power was exercised by a hereditary or elected ruler in the name of the people as a whole and with a view to its general interest. Private power, on the contrary, belonged to every great landowner over those living upon his domain, and he exercised it by virtue of his right of property and in his own personal interest. In practice, however, the two powers took the same forms, consisting of the oath, the court of justice, the levying of taxes and requisitions, and sometimes even military service, so that in dealing with each particular case it is not always possible to distinguish whether we have to do with a survival of public power or an obligation imposed by virtue of the right of property.

The feeling that authority ought to be a public function exercised for the general good seems to have been common to all the barbarian peoples — Germans, Scandinavians, and Slavs — which had remained independent of the Roman Empire. The historians of German law maintain that the conception of public authority was still present

to the minds of the Germans even after the dukes and counts had become the king's personal vassals in accordance with feudal forms which had their origin in private power. The sense of the ruler's public power became weaker again among the peoples settled within the territory of the Empire.

The oath of fealty to Charlemagne taken by all free men still constituted a promise to obey a ruler invested with authority over the whole people. In the lands under Frankish rule it disappeared. A trace of it survived in the land of the Lombards, where the count, in the name of the king, made the notables take the oath, and where officials known as "guardians of the oath" had survived in the towns. We have no proof that the king of the Germans received an oath of fealty from his subjects, and once the dignitaries had grown accustomed to recognizing themselves as the king's vassals, they took the oath in the feudal form, not as his faithful subjects but as his vassals. It is probable, on the contrary, that in England the king did receive an oath from fighting men who had not yet become vassals, and that the Scandinavian and Slavonic peoples, united under the common power of a king or prince, recognized his possession of some kind of public authority, but we do not know whether this took the form of an oath.

Among the barbarian peoples service in war had been compulsory for all free men, and it had become obligatory even for Romans who were subjects of a barbarian king. But when war had come to be waged only by men in a position to equip themselves, the army of the king of the Franks reduced itself, as early as the ninth century, to his own personal escort and those of his vassals, and public service disappeared in the lands of the old Empire. It survived till the eleventh century among those peoples which still fought on foot, the Saxons of Germany and those of England, where the levy in mass (*fyrð*) survived side by side with the body of professional fighting men attached to the king. Compulsory military service was maintained in principle among the Scandinavian and Slav peoples and the Hungarians. In lands where the feudal system was not introduced it never disappeared.

Justice among the barbarian peoples was a matter of public interest, carried out in the presence of the assembly of free men, who were bound to attend. Among the Franks it was customary to hold an

Private authority of the landowner

obligatory assembly three times a year, and this custom was extended to the land of the Lombards. The tribunal was presided over by the count, as delegate of the king and acting in his name; judgment was given by a small group of notables. In Germany the power of administering justice always remained an attribute of the king, and was only exercised by great persons invested with some public function, and by virtue of a formal delegation of power by the king. The same principle seems to have persisted among the Anglo-Saxons, the Scandinavian and Slav peoples, and perhaps the Christians in Spain. In France the public court of justice had its origin in custom, and the power of justice passed to the landowner. The administration of justice by an official according to Roman custom only survived among the clergy and in matters of religion.

All the peoples of Europe recognized the right of the public authority, in the name of the public interest, to impose a tax in money or in kind, at least in case of urgent necessity. But the rulers of the barbarian peoples established no permanent taxes, and even among the peoples settled within the Empire they were unable to maintain any regular tax, for lack of practical means of levying and distributing it. The money taxes levied upon all the inhabitants for the purpose of paying ransom to the Norman invaders in France and England ceased with the invasions. In Italy taxation seems to have reduced itself to a requisition in kind for the maintenance of the emperor's army when he passed through the land. In Germany the king levied a tax intermittently upon the towns, from which fighting men were exempted. In France all public taxation lapsed.

Private authority of the landowner

In the lands where great domains were the rule, instead of acts performed in the name of a public authority a system of procedure became established between the ninth and the eleventh centuries which was founded solely upon the private right of the great landowner. As there were two kinds of men living on the domain and dependent upon the landowner in their different capacities — the peasants who cultivated his land and the warriors who formed his escort — he exercised a different authority over each kind.

The strongest and most ancient form of authority, derived from his capacity as landowner, was that which he exercised over all peas-

ants, whether serfs or free men, settled upon his domain. He could demand of them a practically unlimited obedience. (In northern Italy he made them take an oath of fidelity.) This power possessed by the master was often officially confirmed by a formal act of the king's, a "charter of immunity," which gave the great landowner power to levy taxes due from those living upon his domain on behalf of the king. But since this act of immunity forbade access to the domain to all public agents for the purpose of performing any act of authority, justice, maintenance of order, or levying of taxes, the landowner, who had become *de facto* independent, exercised over the residents upon his domain all powers thus withdrawn from the agents of the public authority. He had the right to take measures for maintaining order, issue regulations, give orders for arrests, imprisonment, trial, condemnation, or execution, to levy taxes and impose requisitions, and even to demand such military service as a peasant was able to render; for instance, guard duty in a castle, or its defence. The landowner, known in Latin as *dominus* (the master), used this authority chiefly for increasing the revenue from his domain. In addition to the dues and labour owed by his tenants as rent for his land, he imposed heavier requisitions and taxes — often more regularly collected than those due to the king — including tolls and the duty of providing lodging, which had survived from the Roman regime, fines, and total confiscation of a condemned man's property, so that in documents of the eleventh century justice was enumerated among the sources of revenue from a domain. He appointed a steward to exercise his authority and frequently even farmed it out.

The other kind of private authority, which had grown up more recently, was that possessed by the overlord, or *seigneur*, in his capacity as military leader, over the warriors of his escort, who entered his service for life. The personal pledge which bound them to their lord was formally solemnized by an oath: the vassal warrior, kneeling before his lord, swore to be faithful to him and serve him against all men; that is, he became his "man." The ceremony was known as *homage*. This custom, starting among the Franks, spread to Germany, Italy, and the Christians of Spain. It was not till later that it spread to the other countries of Europe.

At first the lord had kept his "men" about his person, equipping and feeding them. In France he rid himself of this care as early as

the end of the ninth century, handing over to his vassal a piece of land with labourers attached to it, on which he could settle down with his family and raise the means of feeding and equipping himself.¹ This grant (which applied later to things other than land) was called by a Germanic name translated into Latin as *fevum* (whence *fief*) or *feodum* (whence *feudal*).

The custom of granting fiefs started in France, where the great ones of the land had enormous domains at their disposal, which were already peopled by peasants attached to the soil. The lord remained the owner of the land granted as a fief and retained the right to resume possession of it on the vassal's death. But when the vassal left a son capable of taking his place, it was natural to allow him to carry on the service and keep the fief. By the end of the eleventh century it had become the general custom to give each vassal who was a fighting man a piece of land as a fief and, on the death of the vassal, to accept his son as both vassal and owner of the fief. The great dignitaries — dukes, counts, or prelates — having become the king's vassals, recognized that they held their office as a fief from the king.

This custom, first established in France in the tenth century, spread to Germany, first for the dignitaries who were the king's vassals, and afterwards for fighting men. In Italy the possession of a fief, which remained revocable and was later granted for life only, was not recognized as belonging to a vassal's son till the eleventh century, by an act of the Emperor. In Spain, with the exception of Catalonia, which followed the French custom, the fief did not become definitely hereditary, and the feudal system did not extend to all land.

It was the indissoluble union between the position of a vassal and the possession of a fief that constituted the *feudal system*, but these two indissoluble customs, of vassalage and the fief, became irreconcilable in practice. So long as the vassal warrior had lived in his lord's house, he had felt himself to be his servant and dependent, and as such bound to obey him. But when he became settled upon a hereditary domain where he had his own house, from which he drew his income and on which the peasants worked for him, he became conscious chiefly of his position as owner of the land granted him as a

¹ It is possible that the fighting men with no family remained in the lord's dwelling-house, for there is a romance of chivalry which speaks of the "*bacheliers* of a lord's *mesnie* (household)." These would be the unmarried men, the word *bachelor* (French *bachelier*) having survived in English in this sense.

Conversion of the pagan peoples

fief, and felt the obligation to serve his lord as an irksome burden which he longed to lighten. When the fief came to be treated not so much as payment for a service as the equivalent of possessing a domain, the custom grew up that the same man might possess several fiefs, obtained by inheritance, marriage, or purchase, which he held of different lords. He then became the vassal of several lords and might even be at once vassal and lord of the same man in virtue of two different fiefs. Service might even become impracticable when the vassal owned several fiefs making him the vassal of several lords who were at war with one another. Thus *vassalage*, originally the foundation of the system, was reduced to a formality by *feudalism*, which had at first been only a means of remunerating the vassal.

The authority of the overlord over his vassals, differing as it did from both the public authority of the king over the people and the domanial authority of the landowner over his tenants, was exercised by a new procedure (described in Chapter VII) : the oath of homage, the obligation of personal service in war, the administration of justice by the overlord's vassals, and the sums paid by the vassal to his lord as "aids."

Conversion of the pagan peoples

Between the ninth and eleventh centuries the peoples of Europe remaining outside the European religious unity became part of it by accepting the Christian religion, and the authority of the clergy was extended to cover almost all the peoples of Europe. The conversion was directed by two competing authorities: the Church of Rome, supported by the princes subject to the authority of the pope, and the Orthodox Church of Constantinople, the residence of the emperor. It was seldom effected by the propaganda of missionaries appealing to the people, but generally took place by the aid of a princess who was already a Christian, mainly through an understanding with the king or prince of the land, who adopted the Christian religion and imposed it upon his people. The conversion was often interrupted by revolts and a return to the indigenous religion, and took place only very slowly, between the ninth and eleventh centuries. The peoples who ultimately recognized the authority of the pope were the Scandinavians, the western Slavs, the Hungarians, and a small section of the southern Slavs.

Conversion of the pagan peoples

After long resistance the Scandinavians received Christianity from England. After the failure of a German apostle in the middle of the ninth century, the Danes were only proclaimed Christians in 965 (by King Harald) and were not permanently Christianized till the beginning of the eleventh century, through their relations with the English Christians. The Norwegians, after an attempt at conversion in the tenth century by King Haakon, were only converted for good by kings previously converted in England. The conversion of the Swedes, for which the way was prepared by English monks who went there from Norway in the eleventh century, became official only when the King, who was priest of the sanctuary of Upsala, embraced Christianity.

The western Slavs were converted through the agency of German princes and prelates. Of the peoples settled nearest to Germany, those which resisted were exterminated; those which made submission or allied themselves with German princes became Christians. Such were the Slovenes, who were subdued in the eighth century, the princes of the Obotrites of Mecklenburg, and those of Pomerania, the Sorabes, who were subdued by the German Margrave of Misnia (Meissen). The Slav peoples which remained independent became Christians at the behest of their princes. The conversion of the Czechs, which started in the ninth century with the baptism of a number of chiefs, was resumed by Prince Wenceslas, who fell a victim to a pagan reaction in 935 and became the national saint. It was completed when the Prince of Prague, having become the vassal of the King of the Germans, founded the bishopric of Prague, which was afterwards raised to the rank of an archbishopric. The conversion of the Poles was begun in the tenth century by a Czech Christian princess and her son, was founded the first Polish bishopric at Poznań (Posen), and completed by a Boleslaw, a ferocious prince who imposed religion, morality, and abstinence upon his subjects by cruel punishments.

The conversion of the Hungarians, begun through their Christian captives, was carried further by the husband of a Christian princess from Constantinople and completed by her son Waik, who had married the sister of the Duke of Bavaria. In 997 he assumed the Christian name of Stephen and the title of King, and recognized the authority of the Pope, who sent him a crown. This is the origin of the title "Apostolic King" of Hungary. Stephen sent for some German ecclesiastics, who founded bishoprics and monasteries on the German

model. Once attached to the Church of Rome, the Hungarian people was received into the Western unity of religion and civilization, and with it its subjects the Slovaks.

The other centre of religious authority, Constantinople, led the way in the conversion of most of the southern Slav peoples and all the eastern ones. This was begun on the initiative of a Bulgarian princess brought up in Constantinople, who sent two Slavonic monks on a mission to the neighbourhood of Salonika. Under the Greek names of Cyril and Methodius, they became the "apostles of the Slavs." By modifying the Greek alphabet they invented the first form of writing in the Slavonic languages and the liturgy in "Old Slavonic" which has survived among the Orthodox peoples. The King of the Bulgarians proclaimed himself a Christian as early as the ninth century. The Slavs on the shores of the Adriatic were converted in the same century by missionaries from Italy and the bishops of the coast towns who had remained the subjects of the Byzantine emperor; those in the interior were not converted till much later. But for a long time the rulers of these peoples hesitated between the two Churches. The separation did not become definitive till the twelfth century. The Croats and Slovenes entered the Roman Catholic Church; the Bulgarians and Serbs, as well as the Rumanians, remained in the Orthodox Church.

Among the Russian Slavs conversion was directly due to the clergy of Constantinople and began with the Princess Olga. Her grandson, the King, whose residence was at Kiev, proclaimed himself a Christian at the end of the tenth century and had his people baptized in the Dnieper. The Christian religion then spread among the Russian peoples of the north and the Russified Finns.

The unity of religious authority was now definitively broken. The conflict between the pope of Rome and the patriarch of Constantinople, which began as early as the ninth century as the result of a slight divergence of dogma, ended in 1056 in an official rupture, and the Pope sent two legates to excommunicate the Patriarch. This schism had consequences lasting up to the present day and divided Christian Europe between two hostile Churches. The contrast between them was marked by practices which were very striking to the mass of the faithful: the marriage of priests and the liturgy in the vulgar tongue in the Orthodox countries, and the celibacy of the clergy and the Latin liturgy in the Catholic countries. All the peoples of eastern Europe

Crisis among the clergy

which entered into the Orthodox communion had *autocephalous* churches (that is, those having their own autonomous heads) and, having turned away from religious unity with Europe, were consequently cut off from Western civilization. It was from the Byzantine East that they received their architecture, painting, and literature, and this separation is still to be seen in their writing and their calendar.

Crisis among the clergy

Though in principle the clergy in the Christian countries was subject to a single head, it had been involved in the break-up of authority through being forced, for various reasons, to adapt itself to the conditions of lay society.

In the first place, since ecclesiastics did not themselves produce the things necessary for life, they required to be maintained by the labour of the laity, so that every religious establishment had to possess a domain cultivated by peasants, the ecclesiastical holder of which — whether bishop, abbot, or parish priest — enjoyed the revenues. The bishops and abbots, as owners of great domains, wielded all the possessor's powers over the inhabitants.

In the second place, the bishops and abbots, as the king's vassals, like the dukes or counts, owed him military service. They required an escort of warriors and enlisted knights in their service, granting them lands as fiefs. Thus they came to participate in the feudal system both as the king's vassals and as the overlords of their own knights. They were less powerful in Italy, where there were a large number of bishops, each of whom had only a small piece of territory, and in Spain, where the Christians were very poor.

In the third place, the enjoyment of the domain attached to a function (*office*) of the Church was called a *benefice*. It was a remuneration for work, just as the vassal's fief was the recompense for his service. But just as the vassal had come in the end to regard his fief as an inheritance and the service connected with it as an inconvenient servitude, so the ecclesiastical benefice came to be regarded as a means of livelihood and the office as a burden of which the holder tried to rid himself.

In the fourth place, the clergy, being unable to recruit itself by inheritance, like the laity, who handed down their offices from father to son, drew ecclesiastics from among the sons of the laity. Powerful

Attempts at reform

persons profited by this to provide their families or protégés with a convenient means of livelihood, and the king, princes, and great lords managed to make their younger sons or nephews into bishops or abbots and chose the parish priests from the people among whom they lived. These laymen, who entered the clergy without any vocation, introduced into it the habits of their families. Sons of warriors become prelates continued to make war, go hunting, and get drunk at banquets. The lower clergy, the priests and monks, frequented taverns, played games of chance, and joined in the amusement of the laity.

In thus disobeying the uniform rule which had maintained unity and order, the clergy were adopting the habits of lay society, which was disintegrated, disorderly, and diverse. The disorder affected even the supreme head of the Church. The war chiefs in the neighbourhood of Rome — the great lords of Tuscany in the tenth century and the small feudal lords of the Roman Campagna in the eleventh century — made use of their force to have a pope chosen from among their own relatives or even their family protégés. A pope twelve years of age might be seen going out hunting and dressing like a feudal lord. The scandal was checked for the first time by the German Emperor Otto, who came to Rome in 963, obtained the deposition of the Pope, and had him replaced by a Roman ecclesiastic. The disorder began again in the eleventh century. Once again it was the German Emperor who put an end to it by having the Pope deposed and replacing him by a German prelate. The Pope, the head of the Church, became the subject of the Emperor, dependent upon a foreign prince who was a layman.

Attempts at reform

A few devoted men, for the most part monks, endeavoured to bring the clergy back to the observance of their rules; this was called *reformare* — that is, to restore. They began by re-establishing the rule of St. Benedict in the abbeys hitherto independent of one another. The most important reform, which started at the Abbey of Cluny in Burgundy, took place by inducing them to transform themselves into mere *priories*, all doing obedience to the Abbot of Cluny. This was the first example of a *monastic order*, which, by uniting a large number of convents under a single head, made it easier to maintain a uni-

Material life

form rule and gave the monks a more powerful means of reacting upon the laity. Cluny, having become "head of the order," extended its power over a large number of convents in France and northern Spain.

During the eleventh century the partisans of reform set out to restore observance of the rules among the clergy known as *secular*, because they lived in the "century," or age — that is, among the laity. They attacked two customs stigmatized as heresies, though neither of them was contrary to dogma. The term *simony* was applied to receiving or giving money for the purpose of conferring or receiving an ecclesiastical function, and even of receiving the insignia of the dignity of bishop or abbot from the hands of a lay prince. This was the origin of a violent conflict with the kings of France and England and above all with the Emperor. The term *nicolaitism* was applied to the marriage of priests, and the faithful were stirred up against married priests, who were alleged to be impure and incapable of administering valid sacraments. In the West the priests gradually ceased to take to themselves wives, but the custom of priestly marriage survived till the thirteenth century in the recently converted lands of the north. It has been maintained in all the Orthodox churches of Europe and even in the formerly Orthodox churches which have become reconciled with the pope (known as Uniat).

The partisans of reform had supported the Emperor when he set up German popes in Rome in favour of reform. But they soon found it intolerable for the head of the Church to be chosen by a layman. In order to render him independent, they obtained a decision that the pope should be elected by the college of *cardinals*, that is, the holders of the offices of the Roman clergy, the bishops of the towns in the neighbouring district, and the priests and deacons of the churches in Rome.

Material life

The conditions of social life are very little known to us from very poor chronicles or annals, a few official documents and some charters, the work of ecclesiastics, chiefly monks, almost all of which are concerned with the region between the Loire and the Elbe, where the revival of Carolingian learning was still in force. We have no means of forming a picture of material life, for the representations of costumes, weapons, and instruments from manuscripts and works of art

of that time reproduced in our educational works are no more than copies of Eastern figures. With the exception of an Anglo-Saxon calendar, the most ancient representation copied from real life seems to have been the " Bayeux tapestry," dating from the end of the eleventh century and picturing scenes from the conquest of England.

Europe certainly led a life of poverty and danger for all classes, even the most privileged ones, which was far less brilliant than that of the Orient or of the peoples enjoying Byzantine or Arab civilization, yet less degraded and perhaps even less wretched for the mass of the people than the life of the majority of slaves under the Roman Empire. In this disordered society there was even a slight amount of progress. The water-mill which abolished the very hard labour of turning the millstone, had only begun to come into general use towards the end of the tenth century, when the mill is mentioned in documents as an ordinary accessory of a great estate. The ancient mode of harnessing horses, which, by throwing the weight of the load upon the animal's neck, made a very poor use of its strength and reduced what could be carried on a wagon to a very light load, was replaced at a period unknown to us, but not later than the end of the eleventh century, by the collar, which, by throwing the weight upon the horse's shoulders, made it possible to transport far heavier loads. This invention, like that of the horseshoe and the stirrup, seems to have come from the nomad peoples of Asia, perhaps from the Huns.

BEGINNING OF THE MIDDLE AGES PROPER (ELEVENTH TO THIRTEENTH CENTURIES)



New conditions affecting political life

Since the failure of Charlemagne's attempt to re-establish authority in the ninth century, the most populous and civilized countries in Europe had lived in a state of disorder. Between the middle of the eleventh and the end of the thirteenth centuries, there came into being in these countries a new order of society and political authority which had no precedent in the history of humanity. It spread to those European countries which had remained less civilized and became, by a continuous process of evolution, the foundation of modern life.

During this period of disorder, conditions of life for the peoples of Europe had gradually been changed by a very large number of small processes, each confined to a very limited territory. These had resulted in a transformation of society comparable to the evolution of an organism. From the middle of the eleventh century onwards, in several countries and at varying moments, the life of the people was changed by one of those conjunctures of events which we call "chance" or "accident." Most of these were wars, arising out of the personal passions of rulers, and the result turned only upon the accidents of their lives. These accidental happenings may be grouped in three series.

Political events from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries

The first event was the conquest of England by William, Duke of Normandy, who had himself recognized as lawful king by the Pope,

Political events from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries

and by a single battle became master of the English people. He confiscated the domains of most of the great landowners and distributed them as fiefs among his French warriors. The French feudal system was transplanted into England in a more regular form: All the lords bearing French titles (dukes, counts, barons) were the King's vassals, but the estates granted them were distributed over various parts of England, the lords having ordinary knights as their vassals. Like the duke in Normandy, the King possessed sufficient power in England to make all his subjects obey him, prevent them from king war on one another, and force them to appear before his tribunal. The native clergy was placed under the control of bishops and abbots from the Continent, ready to obey the authority of Rome. Of all countries in Europe, England was the most firmly subordinated to the central authority and the only one in which the whole population was governed by the same political institutions.

A similar work of centralization was carried out on a smaller scale by some other Normans, knights who had set out on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but stopped in southern Italy, made themselves masters of the land, and conquered Sicily, then occupied by the Moslems.

In Spain the power of the Moslems had been weakened since the region subject to the caliph at Córdoba was split up in 1035 among several *emirs* (commanders). The Christian kings in the north took advantage of this to conquer the territories bordering upon their kingdoms with the aid of knights from France. The King of León and Castile pushed his conquests as far as Toledo. His son-in-law received the conquered land to the north-west, known as Portugal. The King of Aragon conquered the territory of Saragossa, which became his residence. The advance of the Christians was checked by the arrival of Moslem warriors from Morocco belonging to a new religious sect.

At the same time the Pope started a war against the Emperor, the King of the Germans, over the question of the mode of investiture of bishops and abbots. Pope Gregory VII excommunicated King Henry IV and declared the latter's subjects to be released from their oath of fealty. The German princes elected another king. Henry, having defeated his rival, occupied Rome and obtained the deposition of Gregory and the election of an antipope.

The Emperor of Constantinople, threatened by an invasion of the

Political events from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries

Moslem Turks, had asked Christians to assist him, and pilgrims on their way to the tomb of Christ in Jerusalem complained of ill-treatment. Pope Urban, a Frenchman, summoned a council at Clermont, at which he preached a holy war for the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre. Those who enrolled themselves for this war took the Cross as their badge, whence the names *crusaders* and *crusade*. The expedition, composed of knights — for the most part French — advanced across Europe and Asia Minor and captured Jerusalem, and the crusaders ultimately established four principalities, the rulers of which organized the land on the French feudal system.

Crusades to the Holy Land went on during the whole of the twelfth century for carrying assistance to the Christians settled in the Holy Land, but could not prevent the Moslems from reconquering it.

Once again war broke out between Pope and Emperor, complicated by a rivalry between two German princely families and among the towns of Italy. The Emperor meant to exercise his sovereign rights over the Italian towns in the absolute fashion of the Roman emperors; the towns, accustomed to being governed by their own notables, resisted. Next the Emperor quarrelled with the Pope over the question of supremacy and obtained the election of an antipope; the Pope excommunicated the Emperor, and the Italian towns took sides for one or the other. The war ended in a compromise unfavourable to the Emperor, who renounced exercising his power in Italy. The Italians remained divided into two irreconcilable parties which continued to wage war upon each other.

In the middle of the twelfth century the kingdom of England had passed to a family of French princes who had also become masters of almost all the western provinces of France by inheritance or marriage. Thus the King of France found himself at the same time the superior of the King of England, who was his vassal by virtue of his French provinces, and his inferior in wealth and power. This contradictory situation led to a war between the two kings Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England, each of whom stirred up the other's vassals to revolt and allied himself with one of the two rival princes of Germany.

A crusade undertaken by some French lords was turned aside by the Venetians and directed against the Byzantine Emperor, who had expelled their merchants. It ended in the capture and sack of Con-

Political events from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries

stantinople and a partition of the conquered territory between the crusaders, who created a transitory Empire, and Venice, which took and continued to hold the coasts and islands of the Adriatic.

John, nicknamed Lackland, Richard's successor in England, having made himself unpopular by his despotism, the English lords revolted against him and compelled him to sign the Great Charter (Magna Carta), by which he renounced all his abuses of power. This is the origin of the rights of the English as against the Government. Philip Augustus took advantage of John's difficulties to obtain a verdict against him as his vassal and conquer all his provinces in France as far as the Loire. He was checked by a second coalition and saved by the victory of Bouvines, which lent great prestige to the Wing of France.

In Spain the conquest of the Moslem lands, interrupted for more than a century by two successive invasions of Moslems from Morocco and by wars among the Christian kings, was resumed after a victory of the Christians in 1212. The King of Aragon subdued the kingdom of Valencia; in the south the King of Portugal reached what is now the frontier; the King of Castile took the largest share — the whole of Andalusia with the exception of the kingdom of Granada — and distributed enormous domains among the lords of Castile, who became the greatest persons in Spain.

The greatest event, considering its lasting effects, was the invasion of eastern Europe by the Mongols, a collection of various peoples of the yellow race from eastern Asia. They waged a war of extermination upon all peoples offering resistance to them. Their sway extended over the most extensive empire the world has ever known, stretching from the Pacific Ocean in China to the borders of Germany. In Europe they subdued all the Russian princes and devastated Poland, Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia. In Russia the consequence of the invasion was to destroy the superiority of the southern princes and transfer it to the Prince of Moscow. It left the Danubian region depopulated, and to resettle it the princes sent for foreign colonists, mostly Germans, who did not mingle with the native population — a fact which was to impede the rise of a common national sentiment.

The rest of the thirteenth century was occupied by the struggle between the popes and the German kings who had become by marriage kings of Sicily and Naples. In Germany the war weakened the

Effects of the Crusades

power of the king by compelling him to grant the princes and prelates powers that rendered each of them *de facto* independent within his own territory.

Effects of the Crusades

The Crusades, which attracted Western warriors and traders to the East for two centuries, reacted upon the life of the European peoples to an extent which is a matter of controversy. Nothing survived of the crusaders' conquests in the East, and the Italian towns lost their direct trade with Syria, to which the products of Persia, India, and China were brought by caravan; but Venice retained possession of a domain on the Adriatic which passed to the Austrian Empire, and where Italian became the language of certain coast towns.

It was in the Holy Land that three religious orders of a new character came into being, the *military orders*, originally intended for the succour of pilgrims and the care of the sick, but afterwards used for fighting the Moslems. Each of these orders possessed its own domain and fortresses. The Templars left the Holy Land and withdrew first to Cyprus, and afterwards to Paris; the Knights Hospitallers or Knights of St. John retired to Rhodes (until 1522), and then to Malta, both retaining the domains which had been granted them in the Christian countries. The Teutonic Order established itself in the region of the lower Vistula, where it wrested from the pagan peoples the territory which was to become Prussia.

It has seemed natural to ascribe to the Crusades all the new customs and things which appeared in Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But the Christians of Europe were in touch with all the Moslem lands on the Mediterranean: Spain, Sicily, Africa, and Egypt. It is hard to distinguish between what came from these lands and what was brought home by the crusaders. From the Holy Land undoubtedly came the customs of warfare, the lance with its pennon, the cross-bow, drum, and trumpet, and the device of armorial bearings as marks distinguishing one family from another; for the French names of colours, some of which are also used in English, are of Eastern origin (*gueule*, English *gules*, being Arabic, *azur*, English *azure*, being Persian, and *sinople*, English *vert*, Greek). The apricot, watermelon and shallot also seem to have come from the Holy Land. The Crusades started the vogue for wearing beards in

The new Europe

the Oriental fashion, instead of shaving them off, as was done by the Romans and Franks.

Far more questionable are the indirect effects upon the political and social life of Europe which some have tried to attribute to the Crusades: the growth of the royal power, the grant of charters to the communes, the enfranchisement of the surfs, the decay of feudalism, the decline of piety (through contact with the Moslems), and even the flourishing of epic poetry.

The new Europe

While these events were going on, and especially during the twelfth century, the life of the peoples had been changed by the rise of certain original institutions which differentiated it profoundly from that of the Orient or of antiquity: nobility, chivalry, courtly manners and gallantry, the communes, the bourgeoisie, the craft guilds, fairs, bills of exchange, banks, Romanesque and Gothic art, universities, colleges, the modern languages, the heroic poems (*chansons de geste*) and romances of chivalry, ecclesiastical courts, the jury, canon law, and customary law.

Society in every country became transformed by an almost independent process as the result of common conditions which produced almost similar institutions. The organization of the European peoples as it emerged from the disorder of preceding centuries was not effected, as under the Roman Empire, by compulsion from without, emanating from a single centre, but sprang up spontaneously in different places as the result of a sentiment common to all men at that time: respect for custom and a will to behave as men had done in the past, which, when translated into practice, led them to follow *precedents* — that is, to find out what their ancestors had done in similar conditions and to distrust all innovations. In every case custom provided a rule and made law unnecessary. Since man does not live very long, this same respect for what was ancient caused the dead man's place to be taken by his son, who seemed a continuation of him and usually lived with him. Everything pertaining to him personally became hereditary: property, possessions, social position, duties, titles, and names. Each family became fixed in the same mode of life, which seemed to become a permanent natural state, and the men who had lived this same life from father to son ended by

The forms of authority

forming a class (French *état*, English *estate*, German *Stand*) sharply separated from the rest, so much so that marriage into another class was viewed with repugnance.

Another sentiment common at that time was submission to the Church (that is, in practice, to the authority of the clergy), which the sovereign, a layman, himself obeyed and forced his subjects to obey. Religion added to the stability of society, for the clergy taught the faithful that it was their duty to remain in the state in which God had seen fit for them to be born. Yet, though hostile to change these men none the less introduced many innovations — unintentionally, it is true — by adapting themselves to the natural changes of life, as men have continued to do in England.

The forms of authority

Authority was exerted under different forms (see Chapter VI): the “domanial” authority of the great landowner, which applied to the people living on his domain, the feudal authority of the lord over his vassals, the public authority of the king and his delegates over all those inhabiting his territory. In lands subject to the domanial and feudal system the king’s authority was almost nullified. It remained more real in the less civilized lands: Germany, Scandinavia, and eastern Europe. It was felt most strongly in lands where it had been organized after a conquest: England, Sicily, and those parts of Spain which had been regained from the Moslems. But it cannot be said that a *State* existed anywhere; the term does not appear until the thirteenth century, in the towns of Italy.

The authority of the king was still inherent in his person; except in England, he was bound to exert it in person if he was to be obeyed. The king was above all a leader in war, the part which he was to play in society being only vaguely conceived. The Imperial chancellery attempted to define it in the phrase: “the maintenance of peace and justice.” The peace in question was not with foreigners, but among his own subjects; the object was to prevent them from fighting among themselves — what we should call “maintaining order” or “policing” them. The word *justice* sums up the whole ideal of that age so far as public life was concerned. According to a French formula, justice should be “*bonne, prompte, roide*” (“good, prompt, and inflexible”) — that is to say, in conformity with custom, rapid, and

severe. It was defined as “giving every man his due” — that is, his social position and property. The ideal was to take nothing from the landowner or his heir, except by confiscation after a legal decision.

The authority of the ruler was carried into effect by various processes. It laid down general rules, known in German as *Ban* and in French as *ordonnances*, which every subject was bound to obey on pain of outlawry — that is, of ceasing to be protected against violence and being expelled from the land (this is the meaning of the word *banished* — placed under a ban). The chief process by which authority was applied was that of arriving at a legal decision on a particular case, but it took different forms according to the social status of the person concerned. Regular justice, which applied to persons living a regular life, known in the country and having a fixed domicile, proceeded according to solemn forms regulated by custom and culminated in a sentence pronounced by the judge in accordance with traditional forms. The judge might also pronounce judgment summarily, “without form of trial,” in order to rid the country of persons reputed to be dangerous, “having neither hearth nor home” or “*sans aveu*” — that is, having nobody willing to answer for them. The English procedure, instituted by an agent of the king’s (the *coroner*), for determining the cause of any death by violence was established for the purpose of stopping murders of foreigners by native Englishmen. But all the forms of public authority were copied by the domanical authority. The lord issued orders in the form of a *ban* to the peasants living upon his domain; he made his agent maintain order and administer justice according to the procedure followed by the king’s agents, and prescribed the same penalties.

All those exercising authority met with the same difficulty in getting their decisions executed and putting down disobedience, their material means of compulsion being particularly inadequate against fighting men. They sought to back up their decisions by invoking the sanction of religion — that is, by the swearing of an oath, which was required of subjects, vassals, and the prince’s agents.

Society being divided up into classes differing in origin, rank, and mode of life, it is necessary, in order to describe it, to examine them separately.

*Position of the Peasants.*¹ There was a difference of origin between the free men, the successors of the *coloni* under the Roman Empire, and the serfs, the successors of the *slaves* under the Roman Empire. The free men, established upon a piece of land of which the nominal owner no longer had the right to deprive them, owed him nothing but small dues and a limited number of days of work; they still enjoyed the right to marry freely and even to leave their land. The serfs had to pay heavier dues and to perform forced labour more frequently; it might even vary at the master's will. In France, where the tax in money known as the *taille* appears in the records of the eleventh century, they were sometimes said to be "*taillables à merci*" — that is, taxable at their master's discretion. They had no right either to leave their land or to marry outside the domain without their master's consent.

With regard to the number of peasants, we have no information except in England, and the proportion between the two categories is still a matter of controversy. According to our information about the end of the Middle Ages, it is probable that France was the most thickly populated country, with the highest proportion of hereditary tenants; all peasants, without distinction of status, were included under the term *vilains* — that is, the men of the domain, or *villa*. The system in Germany gradually became similar to that of France as the free men who were small landowners were transformed into hereditary tenants.

England is the only country with regard to which we have any figures. These are given in the famous *Domesday Book*, the record of a fiscal investigation carried out about 1080 and affecting all domains (except those in the northern region). They probably indicate the number of heads of families.² In it are enumerated the free men subject only to the jurisdiction of the lord owning the domain, exempt from forced labour and paying only small dues, almost all of whom lived in the north-eastern region occupied by the Danes. Most of them are called *villani* (38 per cent) or *bordarii* (32 per cent). The *vil-leins* were liable to fixed dues and forced labour, the latter of which

¹ The origin of the peasants was explained in Chapter V, their legal status in Chapter VI.

² An attempt has been made to estimate the total population at 1,800,000 persons.

might be required every week; their tenure was even more precarious than that of the serfs in France, for the master possessed the legal right to deprive them of it. They were known later as "tenants at will" — that is, at the will of their master. The *bordarii* were agricultural labourers housed upon the domain. In Italy, where there were fewer great domains, tenures were still settled by a long-term lease in return for a share (often half) of the produce. Most of the tenants (*massarii*), indeed, had only a precarious right of ownership, of which the master might deprive them. The Italian peasants did not become hereditary tenants; except in a few northern regions, they were only *métayers*, paying rent in kind, or day-labourers. In Spain some peasant proprietors survived in the mountain zone extending from Galicia to Catalonia. In the centre, which had been won back from the Moslems and repopulated by the Christians, there was a high proportion of persons directly serving the master: herdsmen, gardeners, or servants; the rest were farmers attached to the soil.

Again, the real status of the peasants varied with the value of their land. In those countries (north-eastern France, England, Germany — the only ones of which we have some knowledge) in which the farmer was subject to rules, the normal peasant enjoyed the tenure of several parcels of land and had a yoke of oxen for ploughing, a cow-house, and a barn. But there was an inferior class of labourers known as *bordiers* who owned no beasts or farm buildings and had only a dwelling and a very small piece of land. They worked with hand-tools, probably as day-labourers.

The payments due from the peasants differed in quantity but were of the same nature. They were paid chiefly in kind: grain, pigs, fowls, eggs, wool, linen, and sometimes wax, days of labour on the master's lands at ploughing, haymaking, reaping, harvesting, loading the harvest; and, after the eleventh century, a tax in money, which was often fixed arbitrarily. There was a bailiff of peasant origin, whose functions became hereditary, known in French as *maire*, in English as *reeve*, and in German as *Schultheiss*, whose duty it was to see to the getting in of the crops and supervise the forced labour.

The peasants had to observe the regulations made by the master, who compelled them to use his mill, baking-oven, and press in return for the payment of dues and to await his order before starting on the harvest or vintage. They were subject to the lord's "justice," ad-

ministered by an intendant (steward), who used it for the purpose of making them pay fines or confiscating their property. In France this power extended so far as to include the right of putting a man to death, and had as its emblem the right of having a gallows on the domain (the French word for gallows, *potence*, means "power"). In Germany, Italy, and Spain it was reserved to the great lords to whom the king had delegated this right; in England it belonged to the king only. In all countries the right to hunt was reserved to the master, and the peasants were forbidden to kill game. In the southern lands in which cultivation was not subject to regulation, the system (of which we have no knowledge) must have included similar dues, but of a more irregular character.

The peasants' mode of life always remained very hard and primitive, for they had few means of improving it. The land was very scantily manured and consequently gave a very poor yield; the beasts, having nothing but pasturage to feed upon, with hay in winter from natural meadows, had difficulty in surviving till the spring. In England some of them were slaughtered at the beginning of winter and the meat salted down. The peasants had nothing but their crops to live upon and had to devote a large portion of these to paying their dues in kind or else sell them so as to obtain money for the payment of their dues in cash. When the crops failed, they were reduced to starvation. They lived upon black bread, porridge of various kinds, and vegetables and rarely ate any meat. They wore clothing made of coarse stuffs, often linen, had no underclothing, and often went barefoot. They lived in low, thatched houses with unglazed windows and a floor of beaten earth, having scarcely any furniture, sometimes not even a bed. They, their wives and daughters were at the mercy of the lord's whim, or even that of his steward, and had no means of resistance or of obtaining justice. Hence in every land the peasant was treated as an inferior and despicable being, as is shown by the sense which the word *villain* came to bear in English, or *vilain* in French (ugly, nasty, base).

Changes in Their Position. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the position of the peasants underwent a modification, which took opposite directions in the eastern and western parts of Europe. In the western lands it improved. In France and England the master ceased himself to exploit the lands reserved to him, and

distributed them, in return for payments, among tenants, who became hereditary owners. Since he no longer required forced labour on his lands, he received payments instead. Owing to the fall in the value of money and the greater abundance of coin, the former dues, consisting in a fixed sum of money, became much less onerous. Payments and forced labour, which had been fixed at the master's discretion, became settled and limited by custom.

It became more difficult to dislodge those peasants who had no recognized right to their land. Though in England the villeins remained legally at the mercy of the lord of the manor, they became *copyholders*, owning their land in virtue of customary dues entered on the manorial registers. In France the master's power was limited by a practice already in use in the towns. The tenants of a single village would agree to pay him a lump sum, in return for which, by a written deed known as a *charter* (French *charte*), he renounced all arbitrary proceedings and restricted all dues, taxes (*taille*), forced labour, and fines to a fixed sum.

In eastern Europe, by a reverse process, the free farmers became tenants of almost servile status in the service of the great landowners. The indigenous Slavs subject to the Germans were compelled to furnish forced labour for half the week. In Poland the peasants sank to the inferior status known as that of *kmięcy* (*kmetes*), and a similar change seems to have begun on Russian territory. The degradation of the free farmers which had taken place in the west during the ninth century started in eastern Europe three centuries later.

Formation of the Nobility. While in every land the peasants continued to form the lower class, the fighting men everywhere constituted the upper class. We know more about them than the peasants, especially about those of France, Germany, and England.

The superior rank of the warriors resulted from the character of warfare in those days. The ancient peoples of Europe had regarded war as the common affair of the whole people, all free men being bound to appear under arms at the summons of their ruler. This rule survived in the Scandinavian lands and in eastern Europe (Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary). It was applied even in western Europe by the petty kings of Spain in their wars against the infidel, and by the King of the Germans on his Roman expedition. But throughout

The forms of authority

the whole of Charlemagne's former Empire war was the permanent state, not only between kings and princes, but among all fighting men in every land. It had come to be a private affair in which the families of the two opponents became involved, and all attempts by the clergy to prevent this during the eleventh century had failed. War was now waged only on horseback, the Latin word *miles* being now applied only to the mounted man fighting with a lance. The warrior equipped himself and tried to protect himself as much as possible. Up to the end of the thirteenth century he fought in a *hauberk*, or coat of mail, which covered the whole body, wearing on his head an iron helmet and protected by a long pointed shield. His horse was also protected by armour and he only mounted it for the combat, making his way there on another horse. He required a mounted attendant (*valet d'armes*), the *esquire* (French *écuyer*, shield-bearer), who carried his shield, led his charger, and helped him to put on his heavy armour and get into the saddle before the fight. This equipment was expensive, and to meet the expense it was necessary to own quite a large domain cultivated by peasants. The use of these arms required a long apprenticeship, and war became a profession, the most honourable of all.

In the richest countries (France, Italy, and Germany) the war leaders were the lords owning very great domains, the mass of the warriors being composed of vassals bound to serve their lord in war and provided by him with a fief yielding sufficient income for their living and equipment. The fief was always granted for life only, and the vassal could only enter into possession of it after performing the ceremony of *homage*, in which he knelt before his lord and swore fealty to him. The bond thus created between them constituted a personal obligation and had to be renewed on the death of either; but on the death of a vassal his heir had the right to take up the fief, so that in point of fact the ownership of it became hereditary.

The vassal was still bound to discharge certain duties, and if he failed to perform them the lord had the right to deprive him of the fief. These duties, which were gradually defined more precisely and greatly decreased, may be summed up in three terms: service, which obliged the vassal to follow his lord to war, but was ultimately restricted to a definite number of days (sixty days in the year in France)

The warriors, who formed the upper class everywhere, were known collectively by the ancient Latin name of *nobiles*, which originally occurs in the records in Latin, even in Poland; it passed into the Romance languages, and even into English (*nobility*), where, however, it is confined to *lords*. In German it was translated by the word *Adel*. In the end the nobles came to form a hereditary class so sharply divided from the rest that marriage with a person belonging to another class was disapproved of as a misalliance (French *mésalliance*).

Degrees of Nobility. Although the feeling among the nobles that they all belonged to the same class was strong enough to admit of marriages between all noble families, there were none the less deep-rooted distinctions between them, arising out of differences of function, title, or wealth. The highest rank always belonged to the man bearing the title translated in Latin as *rex*, to which still attached what was left of the public power: the function of acting as leader of the people in war, and, in those lands where the feudal system prevailed, the position of supreme overlord or *suzerain*. The king was always a warrior; his function was to give orders, and to command obedience he had to show himself in person, supported by an armed force. In Sweden and Norway he began his reign by a mounted progress through the country, and in every land the king spent part of his life in traversing his territories with an escort of warriors.

For making decisions of general interest, he summoned a *council* consisting of the war leaders and prelates owing him obedience. He ordered justice to be administered by his entourage, known as his *court*. He had a chancellery for drawing up his official acts and attaching the wax seal to them as the sign of their genuineness. He had a treasury in which were kept his money, jewels, and archives. He possessed great domains, the produce of which, collected mostly in kind, served for the maintenance of his household, and he had a right to taxes paid in coin and varying greatly in amount. These revenues were administered by agents whose accounts were audited at the king's court.

The title of King being attached to his person, when he died it became necessary to settle who was to succeed him. The question was decided in various ways. The usual custom was to regard the father's rank as a heritage, so that it was natural to recognize his natural heir,

The forms of authority

or at least a member of his family, as king. But heredity did not always provide a safe solution. When the king left several sons, the title might either be transmitted to one of them or divided among them, as in Spain or Russia. If only one son were left, a minor incapable of acting as leader in war, the successor might be either an adult member of the family or the child, provided with a guardian. When only a daughter was left, it became necessary to decide whether she should be admitted to the succession and, if so, who was to have the power of choosing her husband. When the king's family had become extinct, it was necessary to choose a successor. This process consisted chiefly of a debate between the great persons of the land, sometimes in the presence of the assembled throng of warriors, for there was no well-defined rule stating who was qualified to elect the king. In doubtful cases more than one claimant would present himself, each with his own partisans, and the succession was decided by war between them; and to attract the great persons of the land to their side, the claimants were obliged to make promises which diminished the power of the new king. This is what happened in Spain, Bohemia, Poland, and later in Germany and Hungary. Hence the real power of the king depended upon the hazards of birth in the royal family.

Below the king came the great persons provided with ancient titles denoting some function (duke, count, marquis), or referred to by a vague title, in Latin *princeps*, translated into German as *Fürst*, each of whom had become *de facto* independent on his own territory, first in France and later in Italy and Germany. They owned very great domains and a number of fortified strongholds, had a large staff of servants and stewards, and held a court, sometimes resembling that of a king, in the town where they resided. They were also able to muster a small army of vassals.

Below the princes came the very great landowners who had no official title, but were the lords of a number of vassal warriors; these were known in the west as *baron* or *sire* (in German *Herr*, in English *lord*). In the same rank may be included even those bearing the title of duke or count (earl) in England, where the king had not allowed the rise of any independent princes, and in the very small kingdoms of Spain and eastern Europe, the Russian boyars and the lords of Hungary and Poland, known in Latin as *magnates*.

The forms of authority

Up to the end of the twelfth century the mass of the nobles was formed of knights who were vassals of some lord, provided their own equipment, and were served by esquires. In Latin they continued to bear the modest name of *miles*, but with the increase of wealth they became local leaders, owning a village which they governed as master and a fortified castle, surrounded by a wall, which served as a refuge for their peasants. Their servants and tenants called them lord. We have no means of knowing how many of them there were, except in England, where an inquiry carried out in the year 1170 over the greater part of its area enables us to estimate their numbers at about five or six thousand. They seem to have been more numerous in the rich regions of France and Italy, but less so in Germany, and there were very few of them in Spain.

In the lowest rank may be included the warriors who were for various reasons inferior. Certain records suggest that there were warriors serving on horseback and armed with the lance, but having no defensive armour or esquire, who were possibly employed in the fortresses. In Germany, too, there were still some knights, known as *Dienstmannen* (in Latin, *ministerials*), in the service of prelates and of the king. They were descended from former serfs, owned no fief, lived in their master's house and had no right to leave him. In the less civilized countries, Poland and Hungary, most of the warriors fought without armour, with the sword or sabre, and were mounted upon horses without armour.

As early as the twelfth century the knights had come to regard themselves as forming a body in which they had as their comrades lords, princes, and even kings. In France, where it first came into being, this body was known collectively as the *chevalerie* (chivalry), which became common to all the Christian lands. No man could enter it until he had been admitted to it by a knight. It became the custom to admit to it none but the sons of knights, so that knighthood came to be hereditary.

The class of nobles increased greatly during the thirteenth century. The esquire, who in the eleventh century was merely the knight's attendant, came at last to be called a gentleman (French *gentil-homme*), or man of good birth, and regarded as noble. He did not possess sufficient resources to equip himself and live in the style of a knight, and so remained an esquire all his life. In England he was

called *squire*, in German *Edelknecht* (noble servant). He did not possess a castle, but a fortified house (*manor*), and had tenants who regarded him as their lord. When a knight died leaving several sons, his estate was usually divided up into unequal shares, the eldest son taking the greater part of it and those heirs who did not possess a large enough fortune to be knights remaining esquires. The esquires were far more numerous than the other nobles, and formed the great mass of the noble class.

Life of the Nobles. The nobles of Europe led a life without precedent in the history of the world, and since they constituted the upper class, which the other classes took as their model, they initiated customs, and even sentiments, which have survived up to our own day. They lived on their domains among peasants who were their inferiors, and had no duty save that of war, learning nothing but horsemanship and the profession of arms and spending their time mostly in riding, hunting, and making war, unable to read or write, yet accustomed to feeling superior owing to their rank and strength. They restored physical exercise and country life to honour. The nobleman's dwelling-place was a fortified house, or even a castle surrounded by a thick, high stone wall, flanked by towers at the corners and defended by a broad moat which could only be crossed when the drawbridge was lowered. The *castle*, the centre of defence and dominion, has remained the type of a dignified abode. In England as early as the Middle Ages, the king forbade his subjects to make war upon one another, and the castles had ceased to be fortresses, so that gentlemen ceased to take up their knighthood or even to possess warlike weapons; but the life of the castle, restricted to the peaceful occupations of riding and hunting, has continued to be the life of a privileged class. Since the cessation of private wars, it has survived as the permanent characteristic of the nobility in every country in Europe.

War was regarded by the nobles not as a misfortune, but as a pleasure, and even as an opportunity of obtaining wealth by pillaging an enemy's domain or taking him prisoner and holding him to ransom. A substitute for war was sometimes found by arranging in advance for a combat between the nobles of one and the same country. This was the original form of the *tournament*, in which both sides fought with warlike weapons, taking prisoner those whom they un-

horsed and holding them to ransom. Another form of combat, the *duel*, which had been practised in France as a form of judicial procedure, became the custom throughout a large part of Europe. It was spread by a new sentiment, that of personal *honour*, an outgrowth of chivalry. The nobleman regarded it as his duty to behave in accordance with the rules of knightly morality; but he also insisted upon receiving the treatment due to a knight. He made it a "point of honour" not to let his courage or loyalty be even called in question, and responded to insult, or even to flat contradiction, by challenging the offender to a duel.

Courtesy. A custom having no connection with war grew up at the courts of princes, which had become the gathering-place of the nobles in every land. The court provided a model for the life of nobles of every rank. There the fashions were set in matters of language, costume, manners, amusements, literature, and even morality. Fashion, starting in France, spread, with French literary works, to the courts and then to the nobility of the other countries of Europe. Courtly manners — that is, the manners of the court — constituted *courtesy* (French *courtoisie*), which brought the rough, brutal manners of the fighting man into contempt. It transformed modes of speech, costume, and manners and affected even sentiments and behaviour.

Since the barbarian invasions, domestic service to the ruler had been esteemed honourable and noblemen sent their sons, while still youths, to learn manners as *pages* or *esquires* in the service of the prince or the lady his wife. This was the origin of a sentiment which transformed the attitude of man towards woman. Among all the civilized peoples of Asia and ancient Europe, without exception, women were treated by men as dependent and submissive inferiors, and by the Christian ascetics they were even regarded as impure. At courts, on the contrary, the *lady*, as wife of the prince and mistress of the house, accustomed to give orders to her pages and esquires, was regarded with respect by these young men. From this new relation between the sexes there arose a new sort of feeling under an ancient name, "courtly" love, voiced by certain troubadours in the south, and later by a poet in the service of the Countess of Champagne. It was reduced to a system of rules and brought into fashion by the romances of adventure of the Breton cycle.

Love as it had hitherto been felt by men had been nothing but desire (this is the sense of the Greek word *Eros* and the Latin *Cupido*), and writers had described tender and respectful love only in women. Courtly love came to mean the service of obedience due from a young nobleman to the lady, his “mistress” in the literal sense of the word (which afterwards became degraded). It was conceived on the model of the devotion of the vassal to his lord and had to be proved by acts of obedience. It had as its object the *lady*, not the woman.

Hence arose the courtly usage known as *gallantry*, which consisted in treating ladies as superior beings and setting them in the place of honour, yielding them precedence, and kissing their hands. Gallantry introduced forms of delicacy and respect into relations with ladies of the court which afterwards became general among the nobility, and later among the middle classes. By compelling men to show a very marked respect to ladies, it raised the status of women in society. This is the most lasting legacy left by the nobility of the Middle Ages. Religion played no part in this change, for no modification took place in the attitude of men towards Christian women in the East or towards women of the people in Europe.

FOUNDATION OF THE TOWNS

(ELEVENTH TO THIRTEENTH CENTURIES)



There was the widest possible gulf between the position of the peasants and nobles who formed the country population. But between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries there grew up a new class, without precedent in the past, which was above the peasants but below the nobles. The effects of this were to increase progressively and, in the end, give European society the character which distinguishes it most sharply from all others.

Formation of the towns

We have scarcely any records about the towns of Europe before the eleventh century, and their origin is still a matter of controversy. The towns of the Roman Empire were not deserted by their inhabitants, for they still had bishops and bore the Roman name of *cit  *, *civit  *, or *ciudad*. The domains of the abbeys and residences of the great lords became centres of population; indeed, the name by which the domain was known, *villa* (French *ville*), is still applied to all towns in France. In all the rest of Europe, in the barbarian lands, where there were no towns, and the lands of the south-east, where they had been destroyed, towns grew up as the residence of a bishop, abbot, or powerful prince. In England and Germany many of them were fortified and garrisoned to resist invaders, whether Danish or Hungarian. In every land they were small, huddled within a very narrow, fortified area, and had hardly any inhabitants but the servants and

fighting men of the great person residing there. The most populous of the towns were certain of those in Italy which were in touch with Constantinople.

It was during the eleventh century that conditions in the towns began to change, probably because the inhabitants had increased in number and were more prosperous. This progress first became apparent in the seaboard towns of Italy: Pisa, Genoa, and Venice, enriched by trade with the far larger and wealthier towns of the Byzantine or Moslem East; and in certain towns in the south of France. The transformation was gradual and the towns ended by possessing certain advantages distinguishing them from the country villages.

The town was surrounded by a wall called by the Germanic name of *burg* or *borough* (in the Romance languages *bourg* or *borgo*), which protected the inhabitants against attacks from without, for at that time war was the normal condition of life.

It was also a market where the country people sold the inhabitants the commodities necessary for food, clothing, heating, and building their houses, and bought the products of industry and commerce for themselves. The master of the town had an interest in this trade, for he levied dues upon sales. In lands where the king retained his power over the lords, he alone granted the right to hold a market and coin money.

The town was the seat of a court of justice which tried cases arising within its territory. In lands where the king continued to wield the public authority — England, Germany, and eastern Europe — he had delegated his power of justice to the lord who was master of the town. In Spain, where the kings possessed only a small territory, with few towns, each of these constituted a judicial area under the king's protection.

The town was a refuge within which the inhabitants were not subject to the arbitrary power of a master, as in the open country. Their relations with the lord were regulated either by custom or by a special written agreement. This new right belonging to the inhabitants had started in the towns of Italy and the south, where there were still some free landowners and warriors who had gradually ceased to obey their lord. The custom which had grown up had ultimately been confirmed by the lord.

A new system, originating in the north of France, was that of the

Government of the towns

commune jurée, based upon an oath, as were all public relations at that time; but instead of an agreement entered into by an inferior, it was a joint oath (*conjuratio*) for mutual defence taken by equals. The most ancient of the communes had arisen out of a revolt of the inhabitants against their lord, usually a prelate. The same procedure was afterwards adopted by agreement with the lord in the form of a *charter*, granted, or rather sold, to the inhabitants of the town, who often took as their model the charter granted to another town. Later, and especially in the thirteenth century, a king or prince owning an unoccupied territory would found a town on it and attract inhabitants by giving each of them a parcel of land inside the walls on which to build a house, and lands outside the walls to cultivate. The town, built all at the same time on a uniform plan, had straight streets intersecting one another at right angles and a public square in the centre. Similarly, in the regions of eastern Europe having no towns, the kings and prelates founded towns and peopled them with colonists from other lands, especially Germans, who kept their own language, customs, and law.

The common feature that distinguished the town from the country was that the lord did not exercise unlimited power inside it. This was strictly limited, or even abolished with his own consent, which was sometimes tacit, but more often confirmed or expressed in the form of a charter in which were enumerated the duties and rights of the townspeople. The charter always placed restrictions upon the powers most inconvenient to the inhabitants — those, in fact, which left their person or property at the mercy of the lord or his stewards. It specified the precise amount of the old-established dues paid in cash and of the annual *taille*, the limits to his right of requisitioning and taking goods on credit, and the taxes levied upon sales and inheritance. It regulated fines by a detailed tariff in which every variety of misdemeanour or wound was enumerated, and settled which crimes were to involve confiscation of a man's property. This guarantee against arbitrary treatment was established by written regulations, in contrast with the general usage of those days, when all rights were derived from custom.

Government of the towns

The system upon which each town was governed depended upon what rights the master of it recognized as belonging to the inhabitants.

Hence it varied greatly from time to time, even in the same town. The variation was due solely to the nature of its relations with its lord and had nothing to do with the importance of the town. Paris, the largest town in Europe in the thirteenth century, possessed less rights than hundreds of little country towns. It was the degree of independence that caused the difference in government between one and another.

The most independent towns were to be found in lands of the Empire in which the emperor no longer had any power. First there were those which had been dependent upon Constantinople, such as Venice and Amalfi; then the towns in northern Italy and the kingdom of Burgundy, such as Marseilles; and later those in Germany which had expelled their bishops and were known as "free cities," and those on the emperor's domain known as "Imperial cities." Certain commercial towns of eastern Europe enjoyed an equal independence: Danzig, and Novgorod and Pskov in Russia. They had developed into sovereign republics enjoying the same powers as a prince or prelate.

Most of the towns did not achieve such a degree of independence, but remained dependent upon their former lord, whether king, prince, or prelate. They owed him what a vassal owed his lord: the oath of fealty, service in war, and aids paid in money. But the town had the right to choose what rulers were to govern it, form an armed militia, defend its walls, make war, levy taxes, and give judgment in all civil and criminal cases. As emblems of its power, it had its own seal for sealing its deeds, a town hall, a treasury for its funds, and a gallows.

There were also towns with an inferior status, where the lord had conceded nothing to the inhabitants but the regulation of their duties, which gave them a *franchise* (or privilege), though without granting them power to govern themselves. Hence the town continued to be governed by an agent of the lord, known as a *bailiff* or *provost*, who had command of the militia, maintained order, and administered justice. This was the usual system in the English towns, almost all of which belonged to the king. In France it was the procedure applied by the king to the towns on his own domain, and even to Paris, which was governed simply by a provost.

The government of the self-governing towns took various forms. The sovereign republics had a "little council," known in Germany as *Rath*, in Italy as *consiglio*, or by the name *signoria*, denoting sovereignty. This had control over war and maintained order. Venice and

Genoa alone continued to have a ruler bearing the title of *doge* (duke), in reality dependent upon the council. The "great council," composed of the richest heads of families, was summoned to deliberate upon and decide matters of common interest; the assembly of all the inhabitants rarely met, and when it did so, this was mainly a matter of form.

The towns dependent upon a lord had rather a different system. The leading citizens, whose duty it was to command the militia, maintain order, and administer the domain and revenues, were appointed for a given term in Italy and the south of France, where they were known as *consuls*. Their number varied from two or three up to ten, according to the town; they had the assistance of professional judges in administering justice. In France and England the chief one of them still bears the name given to the bailiff of the domain: *major* (English *mayor*, French *maire*); there was generally only one, who had assistants often known as *jurés* (English *jurats*), and in the north by the German name of *Schöffe* (French *échevin*, English *skevin*). With him they formed the "municipality" (German *Magistrat*). The council of notables decided upon measures of a general order, collecting the taxes, war, and municipal laws. The full assembly of inhabitants was summoned only in serious emergencies. This system was carried by the Germans into the new towns of eastern Europe. As in the ancient cities, the government of a town consisted of three organs: a small executive body, a deliberative council of notables, and an assembly of the people, which rarely met.

Inhabitants of the towns

The towns were inhabited by a collection of people of different origin and social position known collectively by a new term: in Latin *burgenses*, in French *bourgeois* (English *burgesses*). By the eleventh century the most ancient towns of Italy and the south already had a small minority of householders and fighting men known as *milites* (knights). The number of these increased in northern Italy, where the towns sent out expeditions against the castles in the neighbourhood and forced the nobles to settle in the towns. There they built themselves fortified houses and became members of the commune, which they governed as leaders of the militia and notables on the council. An Italian at the end of the fifteenth century remarks that, because the

nobles live in them, the towns in Italy are richer than in other countries, where the nobles live in the country.

In the rest of Europe the nobles remained strangers to the public life of the towns, even when they lived there in the service of the prince or bishop. In every land, however, there were a few privileged persons who did not work, but lived in the towns either on the income from their country estates or on payments received for the houses built on their land inside the town.

Even in the thirteenth century most of the places referred to as towns (French *villes*) were merely ancient villages or newly established settlements almost all of whose inhabitants lived by tilling the fields and pasturing their beasts outside the town walls. Such was the population of all the fortified walled towns known as *bourgs* in France or *Landstädte* in Germany. Up to the end of the fifteenth century there were still a number of cow-houses and barns inside even the largest towns, and allowing cows and pigs to stray about the streets was forbidden by the authorities. Most of those known as burgesses (French *bourgeois*) were husbandmen, but lived under different conditions from the villeins.

The ancient towns must always of necessity have been populated chiefly by servants and craftsmen in the service of the prince or prelate who was master of the town. In the twelfth century a new population of craftsmen and traders appears. Their origin is not known to us from any records and remains a subject of controversy. The question is to discover where they found customers. The land, which was the chief source of wealth, yielded only revenues in kind, unsuited for purposes of trade. It seems certain that money, though very scarce in the tenth century, had become more plentiful from the twelfth century onwards. Henceforward it was possible to convert the commodities produced by the land into money. The princes and prelates, owning great domains from which they collected dues, and the clergy, who received tithes and the offerings of the faithful, now had the means of buying and selling. The town in which they dwelt bought the produce of the country which it required to support life and paid for it with the tributes of every kind which they levied upon the peasants. There remained a surplus of money with which to pay for the things manufactured by the craftsmen or brought in by the merchants. As a matter of fact, with the exception of a few great commercial ports

all the towns inhabited mainly by traders or artisans were the residence of some person possessing great wealth in land (a king, duke, count, or prelate), and the size of the town was proportionate to the size or fertility of its territory, as was apparent on the fertile plains of Lombardy and, later on, in the well-cultivated country side of Flanders. It was the master of the town and his household who provided a means of livelihood for their tradespeople, artisans, and merchants.

Some of the craftsmen who found customers in the towns were descended from those in the lord of the town's service, but now worked on their own account. But, above all, there were some who came in from outside, and the number of these increased as their customers grew richer, for the latter consumed mainly luxury goods, such as armour, weapons, woollen stuffs, furs, and jewels.

With the exception of the shipbuilders in the seaboard towns, who were rich bourgeois, the merchants were originally transport workers, who went in person to fetch their wares. They were either sailors or boatmen travelling by sea or river, or drivers of horse or mule trains travelling on horseback, carrying arms and uniting to form a caravan. They started as itinerant vendors, bringing their wares to market, where they set them out on portable booths. They afterwards settled down permanently with their families in houses, and finally they hired others for the work of transport.

After living together for several generations inside the same walls, these inhabitants of varying origin and social position came at last to form one body. The population of every town felt itself united by a community of interests, memories, customs, and mode of speech, and this gave rise to a community spirit accompanied by a sense of opposition to strangers. The wall, contracted enough to be easier of defence, compelled the inhabitants to live crowded together in a very narrow space. The little houses squeezed between their neighbours could contain only small, low rooms, dark and damp; some of the occupants slept in the garret, in a loft, or under the stairs. The narrow, winding streets, with no sidewalks, and overhung by the projecting upper storeys, were damp and stuffy, flooded during rain and full of every sort of foul refuse, for there were no latrines or sewers and no street-sweepers. At night there were no street-lamps and those who went out were lighted by torches.

The guilds

Life was bounded by a narrow horizon and still full of danger. The country districts were not safe; inside the towns overcrowding, damp, and dirt made life very unhealthy. Epidemics were frequent and carried off part of the population. Except in the southern lands where the habit had survived of building stone houses with tiled roofs, the houses were built of wood, and since it was hard to light a fire, it was covered in with ashes at night. Houses often caught fire and, in the absence of pumps, it might devour a whole quarter of the town at once.

The guilds

Artisans and traders were organized on two systems, each of which prevailed in a different part of Europe. One of these we know in detail, but scarcely anything is known about the other. The one we know — which we are inclined to regard as having been generally established — grew up in the north-east of France, northern Italy, England, and Germany and was carried by the Germans into all the lands of eastern Europe. Men earning their living by the same profession were banded together in an association called in French *métier*, in English *guild*, in German *Zunft*, arising out of the initiative of its members. At first, perhaps, membership was optional, but having been recognized by the government of the town, the association became compulsory for all those practising that craft. Men in those days had no conception of an association with a limited purpose, like the trade unions of the present day. Once admitted to such a body, a man belonged to it out-and-out and for life. The “corporation” (the very name of which expresses this feeling) was at once a professional union based upon interest, a mutual aid society for the relief of the sick, widows, and orphans and attendance at funerals, and a religious confraternity having as its patron the tutelary saint of the craft, who was carried with his banner in its processions. It had its own headquarters, where the members met for festivals and banquets. It held meetings at which rules were passed for the conduct of members, and had its leaders, known as *wardens* (French *juré*), whose duty it was to uphold the privileges granted to the guild, act as judges in disputes between members, collect subscriptions and fines, and make the round of the workshops to supervise production.

Rules evolved by custom or laid down by the assembly fixed the

The guilds

qualifications for admission to the association, the mode of work, and conditions of sale. The principle laid down was that nobody had a right to practice a craft until he had learned it from a member of the guild through several years' apprenticeship — in England as much as seven years — and that before setting up in business on his own account he must have worked for a master. Thus a guild consisted of three sorts of people: the *apprentice*, a lad receiving board and lodging in the house of a master, whose duty it was not only to teach him his craft but also to supervise his behaviour and punish him according to the fashion of the day by beating him; the *journeyman* (*compagnon*), who lived out and worked under the master in return for wages; and the *master*, who owned the workshop and sold the goods produced in it for his own profit. The assembly consisted only of masters. Almost all the associations were composed of craftsmen. The merchants, who were far fewer, formed a very small number of bodies, in the English towns only one, the "guild merchant," with an organization similar to that of the craftsmen.

The idea running all through this system is that the guild ought to provide a man with a means of livelihood for himself and his family according to the usual standard of living in his profession, but that he should not seek unlimited gains which would take him outside his own rank; in such a way equality would be maintained among those belonging to the same guild. The customers who provided every man with a means of livelihood constituted a sort of property, to secure which masters belonging to the same guild were forbidden to compete against one another, and strangers were forbidden to sell their work inside the town. To keep his customers, the artisan was compelled by his guild to satisfy them by producing none but good work in accordance with custom. The rules of the guild regulated materials, tools, and methods of manufacture in detail, so as to secure a fixed standard of production. They ordered that work should be done in the workshop only, in the daytime, so as to be under constant supervision, and that, before being sold, all articles should be examined; the sale of those rejected was forbidden.

The other system, of which we know very little, was practised in all countries in the south except northern Italy. Under it artisans and merchants did not form compulsory associations having power to impose conditions of the work. It does not follow from this that every

man was free to work as he chose. But members were subject only to the regulations established by the governing body of the town or the prince of the land. These rules may have been to some extent copied from those of the northern lands, but they had not the same purpose in view. They aimed at maintaining order or increasing the revenues of the governing body rather than at guaranteeing the members of the guild a means of existence. As a matter of fact, they left the members greater liberty to set up a business, engage apprentices, and make and sell goods.

Transformation of the towns

The organization of the towns became more complicated, especially during the thirteenth century, in proportion as population and wealth increased. Their population is known to us only approximately and conjecturally. With the exception of Paris, which may have reached 250,000 inhabitants towards the end of the thirteenth century, none of the towns seems to have had more than 50,000, not even the great Italian commercial towns, Venice, Genoa, and Florence. The large towns in Germany may have reached between 10,000 and 20,000; the English towns, with the exception of London, probably remained far below that figure. It is none the less certain that, on the whole, the urban population increased greatly, thanks to the foundation of new towns and the growth of the old ones, for their walls were no longer wide enough to contain them and they overflowed into the suburbs. In the principal towns the increase was chiefly among the merchants and, above all, the craftsmen. It led to a greater division of labour, and they split up into a larger number of specialized professions, several of which would continue to form part of the same corporation.

There was a great increase in wealth, as is shown by the growth of luxury in food, clothing and ornaments, houses, furniture, and the building and decoration of churches. The increase was far more profitable to the traders than to the craftsmen and began to cause a more and more marked inequality of social position among them. The guilds which benefited by the difference between the buying and selling price — those of the shipbuilders, drapers, grocers, mercers, apothecaries, gold- and silver-smiths and money-changers, which had come to be the richest of the corporations — formed an upper class,

known in Italy as the *arti maggiori* (major guilds), as opposed to the *arti minori* (minor guilds) of the craftsmen, and even in the English towns the guild merchant began to assume the government.

While the craftsmen sold their work to home customers whom they knew, in two countries, Flanders and Florence, the cloth-merchants were beginning to produce goods for export to foreign lands and sell them to an unknown public. They developed into employers who no longer performed any manual labour. They bought wool wholesale and gave it out to country women to be spun, after which they had the yarn worked up by journeymen weavers; they gave work to wool-carders, fullers, shearers, and dyers, to whom they paid wages, afterwards selling the cloth for their own profit. The shipyard workers, too, who could not deliver the product of their labour direct to the customer, were possibly engaged and paid by such an employer.

In Italy, where the tradition of the Roman law had not entirely died out, a new kind of bourgeois grew up as early as the twelfth century. The Roman custom of having written contracts drawn up by notaries had survived even in dealing with peasants, and there were a few schools, chief among them that of Pavia, which taught the art of drafting deeds and pleading in the courts. They were held by laymen known as *magistri* (masters) or *doctores*, and they received the sons of rich families who wished to study law so as to become advocates, judges, or members of the governing body of their town.

Before the middle of the twelfth century the masters most in repute had gathered together at Bologna and begun studying the general body of Roman laws, known as the *Digest*. They set up a school of civil law taught by laymen and attended by adults who were destined to occupy important positions in the towns. These students formed two "general associations" (this is the meaning of the word *universitas*) for purposes of mutual support in a town where they were strangers, one for Italians and the other for students from other lands. They maintained the professors by their contributions. Bologna became the centre of the study of lay jurisprudence for the whole of Europe. In other countries deeds were drafted by ecclesiastics, but in Italy a profession sprang up consisting of *legists* (those learned in the law), judges, advocates, and notaries, who were laymen. They were first employed by the governments of the Italian towns, and before the end of the thirteenth century they had provided the kings of Europe,

Commercial changes

too, with bodies of judicial and administrative officials accustomed to a written procedure, who no longer followed local custom, but applied general rules of law.

Thus a class of privileged bourgeois, composed of property-owners, men learned in the law, and merchants, split off from the mass of the townspeople. It deprived the assembly of the people and the craft guilds of a voice in the government of the towns and concentrated all power within the town in its own hands. It formed an oligarchy from which the municipal body and the council governing the town were recruited. As the members retired from office, they were replaced by persons belonging to the same families, so that no accounts would have to be rendered except among relatives. In every country this privileged minority came into conflict with the population. As early as the thirteenth century this class was accused of coming to a mutual understanding for the purpose of misappropriating the town funds, of which they obtained possession through loans at exorbitant interest, and of abusing their judicial functions to oppress the smaller people.

Commercial changes

Trade, restricted by scarcity of money and inadequate means of transport, dealt mainly in luxury goods, which were light, small in quantity, easier to transport, and intended for rich customers, so that they brought in the highest profits. Most of them were brought by sea from distant countries. The great commercial highway had originally been the Mediterranean, which bore the Italian sailors on their way to Constantinople, and later to the ports of Syria and Alexandria, to fetch the products of the East: silks from China, cotton stuffs from India, ivory, precious stones, pearls, glass-work, perfumes, incense, and medicinal drugs (alum, pepper, cinnamon, nutmeg, and cloves) which were in demand for cookery.

The wares brought to the Italian ports were distributed through the interior of Europe by two great routes, one across France to Champagne, the other eastwards across the Brenner Pass and the Danube, or northwards down the Rhine as far as Flanders. From the end of the twelfth century onwards, a trade in heavier goods was developed, chiefly by the German sailors of the North Sea and the Baltic, who brought wheat, wood for building, tar, potash, and fur from the northern lands (Scandinavia, Poland, and Russia). In the thirteenth

Commercial innovations

century this was supplemented by the trade with England, from which foreigners exported the fine wools used for manufacturing the finest cloths in Flanders and Florence.

Sales and purchases were carried on by the merchants themselves, who attended in person the *fairs* held every year on the occasion of some festival (this is the meaning of the word). To attract merchants, the prince of the land would give them a safe-conduct, which forbade anyone to attack them on their way and promised them protection. Disputes among them were tried before a court of justice by an expeditious procedure appropriate to commercial affairs.

Up to the end of the thirteenth century the largest fairs were held in Champagne at four towns in succession, for the different kinds of goods. There merchants from the south, Italians, Catalans, and Provençals, met those of Flanders and Germany. They carried out great wholesale transactions and, to obviate the transport of currency, had already devised the process nowadays carried out by clearing-houses, of setting off the sums to the credit of a trader against those which he owed and paying only the balance.

As early as the thirteenth century the governments of the independent towns of Italy and Germany made use of a number of devices for securing advantages to the inhabitants of the town to the detriment of all outsiders. To obtain for consumers the most plentiful supply of foodstuffs and raw materials from the country at the lowest price, the peasants were compelled to bring all their wares to the market, where a maximum selling price was fixed. To secure the artisans in town a high price for their work, those in the country were forbidden to manufacture similar articles for sale. To reserve all the profits from trade to the merchants in the towns, foreign merchants were forbidden to enter into competition with them, or were only admitted on condition of choosing a merchant in the town as their agent.

Commercial innovations

Commercial transactions gave rise to certain new practices, all of which were invented by the Italians. These became customary throughout the whole of Europe and have continued to be an important element in its civilization. For trying suits between merchants, which called for special knowledge, special judges were appointed, known as "consuls of the merchants." This is the origin of the "con-

sular judges" who developed into the "commercial courts." This organ of justice could not apply the traditional rules of the ordinary courts; it therefore created more rational rules and a more expeditious procedure. This is the origin of "commercial law." — For disputes among seafaring folk, shipbuilders, captains, sailors, and shipping clerks a body of customs grew up which was committed to writing as early as the thirteenth century. This is the origin of "maritime law." — To control the merchants from an Italian town who had settled in a special quarter of a foreign town, *consuls* were appointed, at first in the East, whose duty it was both to keep order among their fellow-countrymen and to represent them in dealing with the sovereign of the land. This is the origin of *consulates*.

The money used in trade was coined by order of every prince or Lord having the right to strike coin, and treated as a part of his domain from which he drew revenue. The coins were cut out and stamped with a different die for every lord. Almost all of them were still called by their Roman name (*denarius*) and bore the same relation to other denominations of coin as in the time of Charlemagne, 12 to a *solidus* (*shilling*) and 240 to a pound (*libra*, *livre*), but the pound was only a "money of account." Very frequently, sometimes annually, on the occasion of the fair, the lord had new coinage struck containing only a small proportion of silver, and since the coins were only cut out of metal, those into whose hands they fell continued, down to the seventeenth century, to clip the edges. Hence the coins in circulation consisted not only of a great variety of different kinds, but of coins of the same denomination whose value might vary, so that it was necessary to ascertain their real value. This difficult work was carried on by *money-changers*, established in the market-places, whose craft it was to verify the weight of every coin and the proportion of silver in it. Those having sums of money in their possession deposited them for greater security with the money-changers, known in Italian as *banchieri* (from the benches at which they carried on their transactions). The money-changers came to use these deposits for further transactions, while keeping the names of *bank* and *bankers*.

In the thirteenth century the Pope charged certain bankers, mainly resident in central Italy, with the collection of the taxes in money

which he levied upon the domains of the Church in every land to meet the expenses of the Crusades. To avoid moving the money about, the bankers invented a mode of transference by a simple device. The customer who had deposited money with a banker received a letter from him which he presented to a correspondent of that banker in another town, where he received the sum mentioned in the letter. This process is still called a "letter of credit." In order to pay a sum due from one client of the bank to another, all that was required was to *transfer* it from one account to another. For overseas trade the person advancing the money entered into partnership with the shipowner or captain, by which he shared both the profits and the risks, but only to a limited extent; this was known as *limited partnership*. Bankers would also advance money to traders and accept goods in pledge — a transaction which in Germany still bears the name of *Lombard*, all Italian bankers having been known as Lombards in those days.

These Italian innovations, which were still practised in subsequent centuries, are the chief contribution made by Italy to the economic civilization of Europe.

The towns as centres of civilization

In the Middle Ages, as in times of antiquity, the towns were the centres where those technical inventions took place which transformed the material conditions of life, and the works came into being which rejuvenated literature and the arts. Since the Renaissance, the Middle Ages have been regarded as a period of inertia during which nothing new was created in Europe. It is true that work was carried on in accordance with tradition, which was followed to such an extent as to impede technical innovations, and that in that age the idea of progress did not enter men's minds.

As a matter of fact, however, inventions were constantly being made, for we see new processes of work coming into use, though we cannot make out at what moment and in what country each was invented. We can hardly do more than give a list of them. Besides the use of the yoke for harnessing horses, which probably dates from earlier than the twelfth century, there were the windmill, which probably came from the East; the bellows for producing a more intense heat in the forge; the mechanical saw driven by water-power; the tilt-

hammer, moved by a stream of water in such a way as to fall upon a mass of iron; the tallow candle, which gives a better light than the wax one; the window made of pieces of coloured glass set in a lead frame; the vault with a pointed arch, which made it possible to build loftier and more spacious churches; pavements made of blocks of sandstone or granite embedded in a layer of sand, which made the roads more elastic and easier for travel than the rigid Roman paved roads, which were damaged by frost and heat. There may already have been rudders proportionate to the size of ships, fixed to the stern-post by iron hinges in such a way as to be beyond reach of the waves, and managed by means of a tiller.

In literature Europe had created no original works for the last eight centuries (with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon poem *Beowulf*). Ecclesiastics wrote only in Latin and produced but imitations of antiquity. By the beginning of the twelfth century some poets in France, known by a name meaning "inventors" (*troubadours* or *trouvères*), were composing verse in their mother tongue in accordance with a new system of prosody, the former speaking the Occitanian Romance of the south-west, and the latter the French of the north. Their compositions were lyric poems in which the poet gave expression to his own feelings, or else epic poems relating the exploits of warriors (the *chansons de geste*) or the fantastic adventures of imaginary heroes, recited by itinerant singers in castles or centres of pilgrimage. The poems of the French, translated or imitated in the languages of other countries, made their way into the greater part of Europe. Thus arose the custom of writing in the national language. The poems of adventure, translated into "Romance" prose, gave rise to the novel or *romance* (French *roman*).

As regards the arts, too, Europe had produced no original work, even in the decorative arts, for barbarian jewelry and the decorative illuminations of Irish manuscripts are, like the churches and statues of that time, mere imitations of Oriental models. It was in France, at the end of the eleventh century, that original works began to appear. The most novel and powerful of them were the churches, first built in the "Romanesque" style, which still used the Roman vault, and afterwards, from the middle of the twelfth century onwards, in the style then known as "French" (*francigenum*) and later, in Italy, as *Gothic*.

This style, adopted in all Catholic countries, left them the possessors of the most grandiose and living edifices that Europe ever produced. Sculpture and the decorative arts failed to reach the same level, but by taking their models direct from nature they created works full of grace and life.

CHANGES AFFECTING THE CLERGY AND RELIGION

•

Changes in the clergy

Though subject to rules fixed by a sacred tradition and regarded as immutable, the clergy were recruited from lay society, and since they lived in the midst of it could not help changing with it. The growth of population and wealth had increased the number of ecclesiastics and improved their conditions of life. The number of monks had greatly increased owing to the foundation of monasteries grouped together under a single head in what was known as an *order*, on the model of Cluny. But their founders, finding the monasteries belonging to the Cluniac order too lax, had imposed a more ascetic mode of life upon their monks. Thus in the eleventh century the Camaldulians were established in Italy and the Carthusians in France, both of them in solitary places, while the twelfth century saw the establishment of the Premonstratensians, who worked in person at tilling the soil and breeding sheep, and the Cistercians, reformed by St. Bernard.

The secular clergy, which was subject to the direct authority of the bishop of the diocese, had come to be divided into two kinds of ecclesiastic, each leading a different kind of life. The clerks in minor orders (that is, below the order of subdeacon), who performed no religious functions, were allowed to marry and their ecclesiastical character was indicated only by the tonsure. They were employed in "clerical" work, involving writing, connected with contracts and law-suits. The name *clerk* has, indeed, survived in English even for those employed in commercial offices.

The priests, who had received "major orders" and were em-

Changes in the clergy

powered to administer the sacraments, performed various functions. The priest in charge of a parish had the cure (*cura*) of souls, whence the French word *curé*; but the incumbent often kept part of the income from the lands attached to his cure and handed over the rest to an assistant (*vicar*), who performed his functions for him. There were other priests who had no duties save that of serving a chapel founded by some pious person and provided with a small income; many of them were in the service of some lord and lived in his castle.

All priests were appointed by the bishop, but had to be presented by a *patron* — that is, the heir or successor of the church's founder — and the patron often chose the candidate whom he presented, and who was in practice appointed, from among his own domestics. Before ordaining a priest it was the bishop's duty to make sure that he was capable of reading Latin and singing Mass, but there was no organized instruction or examination. Most of the priests were capable neither of preaching to adults nor of giving religious instruction to children; the most they could do was to carry out the ritual. The same was true of the prelates who were the heads of the clergy. The bishop ought by rights to have been elected by the chapter of canons, the abbot by the monks of a monastery; but in lands where the king was powerful, it was he who chose who was to be elected, and the election became a mere formality.

The wealth of the clergy was constantly increasing from various sources. The faithful continued to make donations and, above all, leave legacies to churches and convents. The Church did not impose this as an absolute duty, but it was customary and regarded as almost obligatory for a landowner, on dying, to bequeath part of his possessions to some religious institution "for the salvation of his soul," to quote the formula used in the deeds. Thus the convents had accumulated a great many pieces of land, sometimes distributed over a very wide area. In the very sparsely populated regions of eastern Europe, where the prince had broad lands at his disposal, the bishoprics and abbeys had received vast domains. In every land the value of ecclesiastical property and the revenues from it had swelled as the land filled up with inhabitants and increased in wealth.

All ecclesiastical *offices* were provided with a *benefice*, usually consisting of land, and the ecclesiastic occupying an office was allowed by custom to enjoy the revenues of the benefice while delegating its

Growth of the Church's power

functions to an assistant, which enabled an ecclesiastic to accumulate a number of offices and possess several benefices. This usage, which was known as *pluralism* (French *cumul*), though contrary to strict rule, became common during the thirteenth century. The canons had ceased to live together in a community, and their *prebend* was no longer a provision in kind, consisting of food and clothing, but the income from the domain allotted to every canon.

Growth of the Church's power

While the numbers and wealth of the clergy were increasing, their power over the laity was growing stronger. The rules already laid down under the Roman Empire and gradually accepted by all lands that had embraced Christianity commanded all subjects to obey the ecclesiastical authority in matters of faith and morals. It was the clergy who decided what the requirements of these were, what the faithful ought to believe and how they ought to behave. Any opinion declared on their authority to be contrary to the doctrine which it was incumbent upon the faithful to believe was a *heresy*, punishable by death. By the eleventh century it had become the established custom for heretics to be burned alive. Any infringement of the duties prescribed by the Church was a sin and it was the believer's duty to obtain absolution from a priest, who imposed a penance upon him. Ecclesiastics guilty of any serious offence had to be degraded, deprived of their clerical office, and confined in an ecclesiastical prison, known as a *chartre*. Laymen were denounced by the clergy to the secular authorities, who had to administer corporal punishment or even put them to death, a process known as "handing them over to the secular arm." The clergy used what were known as "spiritual weapons" against a layman guilty of resisting the orders of the Church or wronging an ecclesiastic. They consisted in *excommunication*, which was pronounced in a solemn ceremony and by which the faithful were forbidden to hold any communication with him. From the eleventh century onwards, with a view to striking at princes through their subjects, the Church had devised the *interdict*, which stopped all religious rites on the offending ruler's territories.

The decisions of the clergy had always been binding, but its real power depended upon what means it had of getting them carried into effect, and in the eleventh century these were still inadequate. By the

Growth of the Church's power

twelfth century its means of action had greatly increased, and they reached their greatest force by the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The rules of the Church had originally been laid down by the *canons* (rules) of the ancient œcumenical councils, but between the sixth and the twelfth centuries none had been held; later they were embodied in decisions of the popes (known as *decreta*), which were scattered and difficult to discover. At the beginning of the twelfth century Gratian, a monk of Bologna, drew up a collection of them known as the *Decretum*, on the model of the collection of Roman laws. It was a manual enjoying no official authority, but soon came into use among the judges of the Church whose duty it was to apply the "canon law" (ecclesiastical law), and the professors who taught it. Next the popes recognized it as official and had it completed by the addition of their recent decisions. Every bishop established a court in his diocese, presided over by a judge (*officialis*), assisted by a staff of registrars, procurators, and advocates, whose duty it was to try cases reserved to the ecclesiastical courts. It was known as an *officiality*. The limits of this tribunal's rights were undefined, and since it used a more regular procedure than the secular courts, its competence became extended to include causes of an increasingly varied nature. Its competence was defined in two Latin formulas: firstly, "according to the nature of the person (*ratione personæ*)," the clergy claimed to try all ecclesiastics, even those in minor orders, and to obtain the release of all clerics arrested by the secular authorities. It claimed the right to try laymen under the protection of the Church, pilgrims, crusaders, and sometimes even widows. Secondly, "according to the nature of the case (*ratione rei*)," it possessed criminal jurisdiction over all those accused of any crime against religion: heresy, sorcery, adultery and other offences against sexual morality, usury (that is, lending money at interest), and even duels. It claimed jurisdiction over all civil causes connected with any sacrament, matters concerning marriage and separation, burial and wills.

The authority of the clergy often came in conflict with that of the secular lords and princes, for they were unable to agree upon the limits of their respective powers, especially in matters of jurisdiction. The laity had material force on their side, but as Christians they were subject to the clergy. The pope, as head of the Church, arrogated to himself the power of pronouncing judgment on kings, proclaiming

Repression of heresy

their deposition, releasing their subjects from their oath of fealty and commanding them to revolt against their king.

Repression of heresy

After the end of the eleventh century the forms of resistance to the Church in doctrinal matters, known as “heresies,” arose incessantly, but we know them only from the accounts of their opponents. Most of them arose out of the preaching of some man who had gathered a group of disciples about him. Those who had the largest number of adherents had as their field of activity the most populous and civilized countries, such as northern Italy or the south of France. The oldest and most powerful of them, which arose in the East and was afterwards carried into Bulgaria and thence into Europe, was an outgrowth of the ancient Manichæan heresy, which imagined two divinities, one of good, the other of evil, struggling for mastery of the world. The body being the work of the spirit of evil, the true Christian must renounce all the pleasures of the flesh. Those who led this ascetic life, known in Greek as *katharoi* (the pure), acted as clergy, directing the mass of the faithful, known as *credentes* (believers), who mingled in the ordinary life of the world. This heresy reached the south-west of France after the middle of the twelfth century, spreading to the north of Italy and afterwards to Germany, where the name *Ketzer* (Cathars) came to be applied to all heretics.

Another heresy had as its originator Valdo, a rich merchant of Lyons, who had the Gospel translated into the vulgar tongue and, in obedience to Christ's order, gave away all his property, led a poor and wandering existence, and rebuked the luxurious life of the clergy. His disciples, known as the *Waldenses* (French *Vaudois*) or “poor men of Lyons,” dressed and fed like the poor, and, following the example of the Apostles, went about preaching the Gospel and glorifying poverty. Their heresy spread through the region of the Rhône and Alps (where a group of Waldensians still survives) and through northern Italy too, especially among the artisans in the towns.

The clergy, having failed to destroy heresy by methods of repression, invented new ones. Profiting by the weapon used against the Moslems, the Pope ordered the preaching of a crusade against the Cathars of the south and launched against them an army of northern knights, who massacred the heretics and seized their lands. He next

summoned an œcumenical council in Rome, where it held its sessions in the Lateran Palace, and induced it to come to decisions binding upon all Christian countries. Orders were issued to every prince or lord that, on entering into possession of his domain, he was to take a public oath to exterminate all heretics in his territory. Such was the origin of the "coronation oath." The Council commanded every layman to confess to his parish priest at least once a year, the intention of which measure was to enable the priest to find out what all the faithful were thinking.

The Waldensian heretics had attracted the laity by leading a life of poverty and preaching in the towns. Their example was followed by the founders of two orders of monks of a new variety. A Spaniard, St. Dominic, founded the order of "friars preachers," known as *Dominicans*; an Italian, St. Francis, the order of "friars minor," known as *Franciscans*. All other monks, being occupied with their own personal salvation, withdrew from the secular world to a remote domain, where they lived by their own labour or on the income from their lands; but the new orders established themselves in towns, lived in ordinary houses, chiefly upon alms, went about among the laity, and engaged in preaching or heard confessions with a view to the salvation of the faithful. The order formed a single association under the direction of one head, known as the *general*, subject to the immediate authority of the pope. The numbers of these new monks increased rapidly, and since they did not require grants of land, they had a great many houses in every country. The Franciscans in particular, dressed, like the poor, in a simple frock of rough cloth, wearing sandals, and begging alms for a living, became very popular in the towns among the women and the masses. Though possessing no official authority, as both preachers and confessors they ousted the priests, who were far less zealous and regarded them as competitors.

To find out heretics the Pope created a special form of jurisdiction known as the "Inquisition into heretical depravity," entrusted to a commission formed of Dominicans. At its trials it made use of a new procedure, which had previously been used in Normandy and was called in Latin *inquisitio* (investigation). In England this was the origin of the jury ("*inquest of the country*"). Instead of waiting for an accuser to come forward, in accordance with the procedure of those days (see Chapter X for the forms of this procedure), it took

Authority of the Pope

action "by virtue of its functions" (*ex officio*, whence the name of *Holy Office*), by causing the arrest of anyone who was denounced to it or appeared suspect of heresy. Its proceedings were secret, with no law yet to defend the accused, and it might use torture. It admitted no appeal from the sentence pronounced by the tribunal and punishment consisted in either a public penance, imprisonment for life in a dark cell, or death by burning, accompanied by confiscation of property. The Inquisition had jurisdiction over all Christians, both lay and ecclesiastical, and had its own agents and prisons, independent of the secular authority.

Authority of the Pope

In the twelfth century the Pope had supplemented the revenues from the Domain of St. Peter, belonging to the Holy See, by "Peter's pence," paid principally by the northern lands, and afterwards by a tax levied for purposes of the Crusades on all the domains of the Church. It was originally collected by the bishops, but afterwards by his legates, and ultimately came to be used for the expenses of the Roman Church. He acquired the habit of granting benefices, canons' prebends, and the revenues from Church property in all Catholic lands to his Roman protégés.

The power of the pope continued to increase. Innocent III, who was Pope from 1198 to 1216 and who had studied jurisprudence, wielded his authority with the utmost rigour of the law. He invoked the "Donation of Constantine," a forged document fabricated in the thirteenth century, but at that time reputed to be genuine, by which the Emperor was said to have handed over to the Pope the whole of western Europe, and he declared himself supreme over all Christians, even kings. He was already receiving an annual tribute from a number of kings (those of Sicily, Aragon, Portugal, and even England) who recognized themselves to be his vassals. By virtue of his spiritual jurisdiction he claimed the power to judge kings, depose them, and replace them by others. In his capacity as "vicar of Christ" he said that "in his person the royal and the sacerdotal character were united as the body is united with the soul."

The power claimed by the clergy was defined by two formulas: firstly, the Church is a *societas perfecta* (independent society), having its own government, courts of justice, revenues, and "spiritual

arms," and ought not to obey any other authority. Ecclesiastics owe no services or taxes to the laity and ought in no case to appear before a lay judge. Secondly, the pope is *pastor universalis ecclesiae* (pastor of the universal Church) and monarch over all the faithful, including kings. This theory, which had already been outlined in the eleventh century, was reduced to a system by Innocent III and pushed to its extremest consequences at the end of the century by Boniface VIII in the bull which he launched against the King of France: "Every human creature is subject to the Roman pontiff." This doctrine has remained the ideal of the Roman Church where the relations between the authority of the clergy and secular sovereigns are concerned.

Religious beliefs and practices

The doctrine taught by the clergy to the laity is known to us, but we have little knowledge of the latter's real beliefs, or even of their feelings towards the clergy. The records are the work of ecclesiastics, and it would be as idle to search them for the purpose of discovering the sentiments of the faithful who were subject to them as to apply to officers in order to discover the feelings of their soldiers. It seems certain that almost all the laity regarded themselves as faithful subjects of the Church and had a horror of heretics. No unbelievers were to be found except in certain lands in the south, where Christians lived in contact with Moslems and Jews, and from which came the formula referring to the "three impostors": Moses, Jesus, and Mahomet.

The Christian religion, which for centuries had remained an institution imposed upon the peoples by authority, had ultimately become adapted to the feelings of Western believers. The theological doctrine shaped by Greek intelligences could only make its way into the secular world in a very rudimentary form, for the laity received no religious instruction. The chief article of faith for the believer was the existence of an all-powerful and omnipresent God, who kept watch over his conduct and in whom he put his hopes; and also of an ever present Devil, who busied himself with doing evil. What most occupied his thoughts was the "Last Judgment," brought within his comprehension by pictorial representations which inspired in him a terror of the eternal torments of hell.

This harsh and terrifying conception was still held by monkish

ascetics, besieged by temptations, but failed to satisfy the more tender sensibilities of the Western peoples. They felt a need to love the beings whom they worshipped and sought to draw them nearer to themselves by crediting them with feelings of love. Christianity still had a sense of loving submission, handed down from primitive ages, when it had appealed to the mass of the people. This touched the hearts of the women, accustomed to submission and self-sacrifice, and had already found them fervent adepts at a time when the pride of the barbarian warriors was still in revolt against it. But it was not till the twelfth and, above all, the thirteenth century that, by mingling more closely with the lives of humble people, the clergy, and especially the Franciscans, completed the process of adapting religion to the sensibilities of European Christians. From the traditions drawn from the Gospels (whether genuine or apocryphal) they selected features drawn from the childhood of Christ and the life of the Virgin, supplemented and embellished with imagery drawn from European life; and out of these they created the naïve and tender popular Christianity of the Middle Ages. God was still the stern judge, but remained in the background, and the gracious figures of the divine Child and the Blessed Virgin were held up as the objects of worship transmuted into love. In direct contrast with the feeling among Oriental Christians, woman was raised to a place of honour under the new name (which might be called feudal) of *Notre Dame*, the *Madonna*, or *Our Lady* and became the object of a cult analogous to a knight's service to his lady. The tender piety of the faithful was further nurtured upon the legends of the saints, brought together by an Italian of the thirteenth century in a collection known as the *Golden Legend*, in which men found both examples of love and personalities for whom they could feel an affection. These novel sentiments inspired religious songs and lent the products of the plastic arts a varied and animated appearance, in striking contrast with the stiff, dull, monotonous figures of Byzantine art, which still followed the Oriental tradition.

At the same time religious practice, too, was being adapted to the wishes of the European peoples. The Mass and Church festivals became a spectacle pleasing to the eyes by the rich vestments of those officiating and gratified the ear by the austere beauty of the chants and the powerful tones of the organ. The sacraments — baptism, communion, and extreme unction — became supernatural operations

Education and schools

credited with the power of preserving people from sickness or healing them. The tombs and relics of the saints were held to be endowed with supernatural power, the sanctuaries in which they were kept had long since become places of pilgrimage to which the sick went in search of healing or women resorted in hope of a child. The pilgrimages attracted vast throngs, coming even from distant lands; they gave the men an opportunity of performing a penance and women the only chance they had of leaving home and travelling. Processions had become a magical ceremony, and the shrine (*châsse*) containing the relics of a saint was carried round solemnly for the purpose of protecting the land against some scourge, whether famine, epidemic, or drought.

Education and schools

At that time intellectual work was reserved to ecclesiastics, but they wrote in Latin only. Latin, the universal international language, facilitated relations between ecclesiastics in all the Christian lands and ensured the intellectual unity of Europe. But it was a dead, conventional language, unintelligible to the mass of the nation and unfitted to express its feelings. The only living literature accessible to the people was written in the vulgar tongue. Moreover, ecclesiastics drew the material for their ideas not from observation of life, but from the Holy Scriptures in a Latin translation and from the commentaries written by the Fathers and Doctors of the Latin Church, who interpreted the text in accordance with a method developed during the decadent period of Greek philosophy by the mystical Neo-Platonic school. According to this method, every passage in a text had three different interpretations: the literal, the moral, and the mystical sense, the literal sense being merely the outer veil of the deeper one. Thus in the Bible story of David and Goliath, David signified the Church and Goliath Satan. Hence churchmen, accustomed to look for a hidden meaning or an allegory in everything, without paying attention to its precise meaning, gave expression to ideas beyond the comprehension of the laity.

If the clergy produced a decisive effect upon the intelligence of the laity, this is because they were the only people who received or imparted instruction. No schools had survived but those founded by a bishop or monastery, and these taught nothing but the learning which survived at the end of the Empire, known collectively by the

name of the "seven liberal arts," and divided into two groups, the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*. The *quadrivium* (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) had come to consist of a very few ideas. By that time education actually included nothing but the *trivium*: *grammar*, which consisted in expounding a few authors, chiefly of the decadent period; *rhetoric*, the art of prose and verse composition; and *logic*, which had come to mean no more than a few fragments translated from Aristotle.

A revival of learning started in the twelfth century, the origin of which is unknown to us. Men eager for education flocked to the towns in which they had heard that some learned master was engaged in teaching. Abélard of Paris could no longer find a hall large enough to contain his audience and lectured in the open air. Both masters and pupils believed that all learning was contained in the works of the ancients, and in the twelfth century they read them in a simple-minded spirit and tried to understand them. It was not till the end of the twelfth century that the works of Aristotle, translated from Greek into Arabic and from Arabic into Latin, came to be known in Paris, together with the learned commentaries of Moslem and Jewish scholars, Averroes and Avicenna. The ecclesiastics who revived the doctrine of Aristotle were soon condemned as heretics, and the Pope forbade it to be taught.

In Paris the masters and their pupils, known as *écoliers* (*scholars*), organized themselves into an association subject to the authority of the bishop and known first as *Studium generale* and later as *Universitas* (university) — that is, "general association." Its system differed widely from that at Bologna. The subjects studied, being intended for prospective ecclesiastics, were concerned with theology, canon law, and philosophy; but since all books were written in Latin, the pupils all had to prepare for their study by learning Latin. Most of the masters were engaged in teaching Latin to beginners. They had first to obtain permission (*licentia*) from the bishop's chancellor to teach, after giving proof of their ability to do so by a test called *examen*. They then assumed the title of *licentiate* or *magister*, the equivalent of that of *doctor*. They taught wherever they could find a place to do so, often in the chief room of an inn, where the pupils sat on the floor on straw.

The university consisted of both masters and students, but the mas-

ters alone had control of the association. It was divided into *faculties*, according to the subject taught: *theology*, *canon law*, or *arts* (this was the preparatory section, in which Latin was learned before a student proceeded to the study of philosophy). The faculty of *medicine*, which was founded later, made up the number of faculties to four. The university was divided into four *nations*, according to the land of origin of its members. The head of it, known as the *rector*, was elected by the masters in the Faculty of Arts, of whom there was by far the largest number.

Most of the scholars, being destined for some ecclesiastical career, were poor and lived wretchedly. Hostels known as *colleges* were founded by benefactors where they were given board and lodging and placed under a discipline modelled on the monastic rule. The new orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans founded houses equipped with a library and class-rooms, in which, having obtained a "licence," the friars started teaching, in spite of opposition from the other masters.

The instruction consisted in reading the text of an author, dictating it to the pupils, and commenting upon it. At the beginning of every year the authorities distributed books among the masters. Those receiving books on a subject in which there was to be an examination were known as *ordinary*, the rest as *extraordinary*. The students passed through several *degrees* (*gradus*); at the end of their Latin studies they became bachelors (*baccalaureus*); after the examination for their licence, masters (*magister*). The degree of *doctor*, which became usual later, required only a ceremony of admission.

In the thirteenth century the University of Paris was the educational centre to which the largest number of masters and students resorted. It numbered men from all countries; the most celebrated masters were foreigners, one a German, Albertus Magnus, another an Italian, Thomas Aquinas. It became the model copied by universities in every land, with the exception of Italy, where law and medicine were taught by laymen.

Thus there grew up a new type of educational establishment, entirely different from the schools of antiquity or those of the Moslem lands. It still survives to this day and uses the names that have come down from the Middle Ages: university, faculties, colleges, examinations, theses, degrees, and the titles of bachelor, licentiate, and doctor.

Influence of the clergy upon the arts

Before the end of the thirteenth century instruction assumed a systematized form under the name of *scholasticism* (the learning of the schools). This attempted to reconcile the two subjects studied at the universities: theology, based upon revelation, and logic and metaphysics, drawn from the works of Aristotle. It sought to prove that the higher truths which are the object of faith are revealed by God, but are in harmony with the philosophic ideas discovered by human reason.

Influence of the clergy upon the arts

The ecclesiastics wrote only in Latin and spoke Latin at the universities, and though they developed it into a more flexible language than ancient Latin, they did not succeed in creating a living literature. They also had a part in the works produced by the arts. All the monuments of Romanesque and Gothic art were destined for the churches: the fabric itself, the statues, bas-reliefs, and ornaments.

But most of all, the clergy contributed towards the progress of music. Thanks to the use of the organ, they provided it with an instrument of nobler and more powerful expressiveness. They brought about a transformation in vocal music through the invention of part-singing. It was an Italian monk, Guido of Arezzo, who invented the system of musical notation and gave the notes the names which they still bear today. It was Italian ecclesiastics who composed the most famous hymns of the Church: the *Dies Iræ* and the *Stabat Mater*.

END OF THE MIDDLE AGES

(FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES)



Events in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

It was during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the period most fertile in original creations, that the foundations of European society and of its economic, religious, and intellectual life were laid. The period of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which has been called "the autumn of the Middle Ages," was marked above all by political and technical innovations. Politically it presents an abnormal feature which surprises us: all the great states were paralysed and impoverished by wars and internal disturbances; power and wealth were in the hands of small states: Venice, Genoa and Florence, Catalonia and Portugal, the Netherlands and the Swiss Confederation, Denmark and Bohemia. The richest prince with the most luxurious court of the fifteenth century, the Duke of Burgundy, who owned the Low Countries, did not even bear the title of King.

Events no longer produced such a strong reaction as in previous centuries. In the fourteenth century they affected only limited areas. They were: the revolts of the Count of Flanders' subjects; the conquest of the pagan peoples on the shores of the Baltic by the two military orders, the Teutonic Order and the Knights of the Sword, which founded the Christian countries of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia; the victories won by the warlike peasants of the Alps over the princes of Austria, which were to prepare the way for the rise of the Swiss people; the war between the kings of France and England (1339-78), beginning with

two defeats of the French knights and ending in the retreat of the English armies, which closed the first part of the "Hundred Years' War."

It was in eastern Europe that the events of the fifteenth century caused the greatest disturbance. First and foremost came the invasion of the Ottoman Turks, who subdued the whole of the Balkan Peninsula and finally, in 1453, captured Constantinople; there was also the victory of Poland over the Teutonic Order, which made her mistress of the lower Vistula; the revolt of the Czechs of Bohemia, which for the first time compelled the Church to conclude a treaty of peace with the heretics; the second part of the Hundred Years' War (1415-53), which ended in the expulsion of the English from the whole of French territory; a little war between the husbands of the two princesses laying claim to the crown of Castile, which had as its result the foundation of Spanish unity, by uniting the central region (Castile and Andalusia) with that of the east (Aragon and Catalonia); and the victory of the Swiss Confederation over the Duke of Burgundy, which lent the Swiss their prestige as a military power.

Changes in the secular authority

The centre of authority had been modified in different ways in the various regions of Europe. It continued to split up into small ruler-ships over territories of very varied area throughout the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation," including the old Germany between the Rhine and the Elbe with all its dependencies (the Netherlands, Lorraine, and Switzerland), and the lands with a Slav population subdued by the Germans and organized in frontier provinces known as *marks* (the archduchy of Austria, the mark of Meissen, known by the name of Saxony, and Brandenburg). Italy, too, was a dependency of the Empire, with the exception of the kingdom of Sicily, which was divided between two kings.

The emperor, who had remained nominally supreme, was elected by the most powerful of the princes, reduced in 1346 by a formal act to the seven "electoral princes." The real authority was exerted by the princes, prelates, and governing bodies of the towns, each on its own territory, where it possessed the power of administering justice, coining money, and even making war. The most powerful princes were those of the lands conquered in the east: Austria, Saxony, and

Brandenburg, which possessed one or even several provinces in which they were obeyed even by the feudal lords. On the other hand, the old Germany in the west was split up among a very large number of towns and quite petty princes, with the title of *Graf* (count) and even of baron only. Many towns had attempted to form defensive leagues, but the only lasting one was the perpetual confederation based on a common oath taken by the peasant warriors and a few towns called *Eidgenossen* (associated in an oath), known, from the fifteenth century, by the name of Schwyz, one of its most ancient members.

In Italy the supreme authority, already split up among the princes and the towns, became concentrated in larger areas formed by the more powerful of them which had conquered and subdued the weaker. The towns enriched by overseas trade or industry — Venice, Genoa, and Florence — had extended their sway over a whole region (Venetia, Liguria, Tuscany). They referred to themselves by a new term, *Stato* (State), which later passed into all the European languages. In other regions, especially during the fifteenth century, a lord or a mere military leader would establish his absolute power over a town, or even a territory. The most powerful of these, who became Duke of Milan, controlled the greater part of Lombardy.

In all the rest of Europe every country had a hereditary king, whose title was handed down in a family recognized by the great lords and prelates. The eldest son succeeded to the throne, but when he left only daughters the succession was settled in various ways. Most countries admitted the eldest daughter to the succession, which at times led to a conflict and even a war over the choice of her husband, and handed over the government of the country to a foreign prince.

The title of King had become indivisible, but except in England the ancient custom of partitioning the territory among the children resulted in a reluctance to leave the younger sons unprovided with a heritage. In the Scandinavian countries, Bohemia, and Poland, the kings still continued to detach some of their provinces for their younger sons.

The territory belonging to every royal family had become a fixed area and was known as a kingdom (French *royaume*), with a town for its capital, which was the king's usual residence. It became the permanent framework of a political community, welding all its subjects who had long been ruled by the same family into a unity, in which a

national sentiment was beginning to grow up, chiefly as the result of foreign wars.

The states in the greater part of Europe had taken shape by the end of the fifteenth century. In the west there was the kingdom of Portugal, the state of Spain, formed by the union of two groups of small kingdoms (the crown of Castile and the crown of Aragon); the kingdom of France, increased by the annexation of lands which had been dependencies of the Empire; the kingdoms of England (with Ireland) and Scotland; the kingdoms of Sicily and Naples in Italy; in the north the three kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, which had been subject to the king of Denmark since the union of 1397; in the east the three kingdoms of Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland, the last now united with Lithuania as the result of a marriage. The territories of the Russian princes still tributary to the khan of Tartary had been united by the end of the fifteenth century under the sole dominion of the prince of Moscow.

The authority of the king had undergone a transformation following opposite directions in different countries. The king of England continued to exert the strongest and most centralized authority. He imposed the same system of government upon all his subjects, even those occupying the highest dignities, and still possessed the power of criminal jurisdiction over them all. He sent out royal judges on circuit all over the kingdom to preside over the *assizes*. He had only a very small number of paid officials, resident in London, about his person: two groups of judges, dealing one with civil suits and the other with criminal cases, and a group of financial agents in charge of the revenue, who audited the accounts. In every county the functions of maintaining order and administration were conferred by the king upon rich landowners as an honour, but also as an unpaid and compulsory duty. In every county there was a lord-lieutenant who was the commander of the armed forces and a sheriff responsible for executions, and scattered all over the kingdom were a large number of "justices of the peace," who settled all local affairs and gave judgment upon them. All these were appointed by the king and could be dismissed at his discretion.

The king of France was not obeyed all over his kingdom *qua* king. The provinces in the possession of one of his vassal princes remained subject to the power of the prince and were governed as an independent

state. The king only exercised a real authority over the lands of the royal domain which belonged to him in his capacity as a territorial prince. But this domain had increased. By the end of the fifteenth century, thanks to the incorporation in it of almost all the provinces of the kingdom and even of certain lands outside its frontiers, it had come to embrace a territory larger and with a higher population than the kingdom of England, and the king had gained power to prevent war within it and had become the supreme fountain of justice. He entrusted the various departments of government to a permanent body of agents whom he remunerated by either paying them a salary or granting them the right to levy dues. A number of bodies had split off from the “*conseil du roi* (king’s council),” whose duty it was to deal with the various departments of justice: a *Parlement* for ordinary justice, a *cour des comptes*, whose business it was to audit the accounts of the royal domain, and later a *cour des aides* for dealing with suits arising out of taxation. Following the king’s example, all the princes established similar courts in their own provinces.

The staff of persons necessary for carrying out the work of government was formed by a different process in each of the two kingdoms: in England by granting honorary offices to the notables, which they discharged without payment; in France by the creation of paid officials. Both these methods, or sometimes a combination of the two, were employed in other kingdoms and in the territories of princes or towns. In all parts of Europe the French system was far more frequent.

In almost all the other kingdoms the power of the king diminished. As the result of various accidents, he was not so well obeyed by the great persons, the lay dignitaries, prelates, and lords. In Scotland six kings in the space of two centuries were minors and incapable of governing; in Spain the succession was disputed among various members of the royal family; in Naples between two rival families of foreign origin. In Sweden and Norway the royal families had become extinct and the nation was unwilling to obey a Danish king. In the kingdoms of eastern Europe, Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, in which the dynasty had become extinct, the title of King was contended for by foreign competitors and tended to become elective. The great ones of the land took advantage of this to compel the king, before entering into possession of his power, to swear to maintain their privileges and not to impose any taxes upon them.

Changes in the ecclesiastical authority

The authority of the clergy had become transformed and weakened. To deal with the increasingly complicated business of the churches of Europe, the popes had created a staff of officials, maintained at their own expense; and they stood in growing need of money at the very time when the towns in the States of the Church over which they ruled had ceased to obey them. They used their spiritual power over the clergy and the faithful in the Christian lands to complete the establishment of the fiscal system already outlined in the thirteenth century. Taxes were imposed upon *benefices*; that is, upon the property attached to ecclesiastical functions. The pope levied a due equivalent to an average year's income upon every ecclesiastic entering into possession of a benefice, another one in return for the promise of a benefice when it should fall vacant, another upon a benefice the possessor of which should die while in Rome, another in return for a *dispensation*, exempting the holder of a benefice from residence in the place where he should have discharged his functions, another for permission to hold several benefices simultaneously, and others for appeals to the court of Rome. The faithful paid taxes for dispensations from penance or abstinence, for marriages between relatives or the annulment of marriages.

By the fourteenth century these customs had become organized into a system, at the time when the popes had left Rome and established themselves at Avignon, where they were recruited among southern Frenchmen. The clergy and the faithful were exasperated, chiefly because of the profits accumulating in the hands of those about the pope's person. The Italians, discontented at being deprived of the pontifical court, called the period of residence at Avignon the "Babylonian captivity." The authority of the Holy See, already shaken, was still further weakened after the return of the pope to Rome, when the French cardinals, dissatisfied with the new Pope, elected another, who took up his residence at Avignon. Each of the two excommunicated his rival, with all his adherents. The kings were divided between the two parties, and the Christian world was cut in two by the "Great Schism." All Christians at that time were excommunicated by either one pope or the other and menaced with damnation, while having no means of knowing for certain whether he were the genuine one.

Growth of assemblies

The impression gradually spread through Europe that the Church required to be *reformed* — that is to say, restored. The professors at the universities demanded reform, and the University of Paris took the initiative in proposing the form this should take. After some abortive attempts to restore unity by an agreement between the two popes, the Great Schism was terminated by the general Council of Constance, consisting of bishops from all countries, which deposed the two rival popes and elected a new one, who took up his residence in Rome. But the Pope refused to carry out the reform, and a second Council (at Basel), on which the representatives of the universities sat for the first time, undertook to impose it upon him. The result was a violent conflict which revealed the impotence of the Council. This crisis left people with the impression that the Church stood in need of reformation “in its head and members.” Another consequence was the doctrine, professed by the clergy of France, that the council possesses an authority superior to that of the pope in matters of faith.

Political innovations

The end of the Middle Ages was particularly fertile in new political institutions which prepared the way for the new conditions prevailing under the modern monarchies: representative assemblies, a standing army, taxation, and courts of justice staffed by professional judges.

Growth of assemblies

As early as the twelfth century, especially in Spain, when a king had to make some decision so grave that he did not feel the advice of his ordinary council to be sufficient, he summoned the principal persons in his realm to his court, together with his council. This is the origin of the Spanish term *Cortes*. Towards the middle of the thirteenth century the King of England began to summon the extraordinary assembly known by the French name of *Parliament*, attended not only by prelates and lords, who were the king's vassals, but also by two delegates of the landowners from every country and from each of the towns or boroughs designated by the king; hence it was known as the “community of the whole realm of England (*communitas totius regni Angliæ*).” The King of Scotland followed this example by summoning a parliament.

The King of France, being engaged in a struggle with the Pope, summoned an assembly of the "three *Estates*" (*États*) — that is, of the privileged classes, the clergy, nobles, and bourgeois. Assemblies of notables were summoned from among their subjects by the kings of Spain, the Scandinavian lands, and eastern Europe, as well as by the German princes in their territories, where it was called the *Landtag* (diet of the land). Italy was the only country that had no assembly.

These assemblies were attended in person by the great ones of the land, the prelates, lay dignitaries, and lords; the smaller nobility and bourgeois, who were too numerous to attend in a body, were represented by delegates. The representatives were not always elected; they were sometimes the dignitaries of a town. The mass of the peasants was not represented in any country except Sweden and the Tirol, where they owned their land.

The assembly bore different names in the various countries. In Latin it was called *diæta*. But in all of them it was divided into sections, each performing its functions separately in a different hall, whence the names *House* and *Chamber*. The number of these differed according to the principle upon which the groups were constituted. In the Parliaments of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, the Cortes of Castile, and the Diets of Hungary and Poland, there were two Chambers only, one for the great people (lords and prelates), and the other in which the representatives of the lesser nobility and towns met. There were three Chambers in France in the "Assembly of the Estates": the clergy, nobles and bourgeoisie; and also in those lands where the clergy did not form part of the assembly, but the nobility was divided into *lords* and *gentlemen*; as well as where the towns constituted one section; for example, in Catalonia and in all the German states. In Sweden there were four: the nobility, clergy, bourgeois, and peasants.

During the nineteenth century division into two chambers became the system in all states, in imitation of the English Parliament, and, thanks to this origin, three customs persisted in all the assemblies: Firstly, the Chambers met at the same town and held their sessions simultaneously. Secondly, the assembly only existed at the will of the king, who summoned it to the place he chose and when he chose. This summons was always a command issued to his subjects. Those

Part played by the assemblies

summoned were bound to come at their own expense and stay as long as the prince ordered them. Attendance continued to be compulsory in principle, a duty rather than a right. Thirdly, the assembly could never meet as a right; it never became a regular event and was not summoned either at fixed intervals or for a date fixed in advance. It always remained dependent upon the prince, and up to the present day the king has retained the right to summon it, adjourn it, and even dissolve it at will.

Part played by the assemblies

At first the assembly had no function save that of giving its approval to some exceptional decision of the king's, running contrary to custom. It might also make a written rule, called by the English a *statute*, as distinguished from the *common law*, which in England meant customary law, but was treated as law in the Continental countries. But the kings preferred a more expeditious procedure for making new rules. They issued *ordinances*, also known as *edicts*, which were binding upon all their subjects. But to obtain money they still had to summon an assembly, for private property was regarded by custom as inviolable. To raise a levy upon part of it in the form of taxation, they had to have the express consent of the owners. They accordingly asked the assembly, representing property-owners, for permission to levy taxation on their lands, or, rather, on the peasants who were their tenants and were not consulted. The assembly argued over the sum demanded by the king and, after a process of haggling which sometimes lasted a long time, fixed the sum which it would consent to pay. This consent, which afterwards took the form of *voting* taxation, was the chief and often the sole function of all assemblies.

In all countries the assembly attempted to use the king's need for this consent to obtain some concession in return. It often petitioned for it in the form of a statement of grievances (*doléances*). It would denounce the acts of the king or his agents as contrary to law or custom and try to extort a written promise to give up these abuses. In England it only succeeded in obtaining the establishment of a new law by using the procedure of a *petition*, which passed into a *statute* when the king had announced his acceptance of it. In the kingdoms of eastern Europe the assembly compelled the king to sign an agreement in the form of a treaty (*capitulatio*), by which he promised to respect the

The standing army

privileges of his subjects and, above all, not to give any offices or domains to foreigners, but to reserve all favours for the nobles of the country.

The standing army

Hitherto war had been waged by assembling either all free men who were warriors, according to the custom of the barbarians, or else the vassals owing feudal service, all men being obliged to equip themselves and make war at their own expense. But the general levy had come to be confined by custom to the cases of invasion and feudal service for a few days in the year. In order to keep his men longer, the king had begun to pay them; but this system did not suffice for a long war. In the fourteenth century it became the general custom to engage fighting men for an unspecified period and, by giving them regular pay, to keep them till they were no longer required. A class of professional fighting men sprang up, known in the various languages by a name recalling their origin: *soldat*, *soldado*, *soldier*, *Söldner*.

The Government, whether king, prince, or town, did not engage each soldier separately; it made a bargain with a leader, who brought his own companions with him. This is the origin of the name *company*, applied to the troop, and *capo* or *captain*, applied to the leader. The pay was handed over in a lump sum to the leader, who distributed it among his companions, and in order to make sure that the effectives were complete, a commissary would inspect the troop. The leader was a knight, but he found his companions where he could, choosing for preference gentlemen, but also adventurers of any origin. Valour was of more importance than birth. The companies, which varied greatly in numbers, were collected together under the command of some great person.

The soldiers had no lasting bonds with any prince; they took service where they pleased and would pass from one side to the other. The army attracted professional soldiers from every land. The name by which they were known (English, Navarrese, French) was that of the prince in whose service they were at the moment. Nor was the prince in any way bound towards the soldiers; he could dismiss them at will and sent them away at the end of the war. The only standing army was that in the service of the sultan, consisting of *spahis* or cav-

Armaments and tactics

alry, and *janissaries* or infantry, recruited by the forced enlistment of lads belonging to Christian families.

The soldiers received their pay very irregularly and had no magazines for supplies. But they were accustomed to regarding war as a lucrative occupation, capturing prisoners by whom they were paid ransom, or castles which they sold, and, what is more, living on the country at the expense of the inhabitants. They stopped and robbed merchants and made the towns pay in order to prevent an attack. Above all, they pillaged the countryside, carrying off cattle and crops and torturing the peasants to force them to disclose where their money was hidden. These ways were usual in every land and were practised in France both in the fourteenth century by the "great companies" and in the fifteenth century by the "*écorcheurs*" (skinners).

Armaments and tactics

War was still waged principally by mounted men. These were of two kinds, each with a different social position. The man-at-arms (*homme d'armes*), protected by metal armour, rode a horse having a similar protection and fought by charging with a lance. Since the fourteenth century the coat of mail has been ousted by plate armour made of jointed pieces of metal covering every part of the body, the head being protected by a closed helmet with a movable visor. This was the meaning of the French expression "*armé de toutes pièces*" (wearing all his pieces of armour)."

The horseman who rode a horse with no protective armour fought with the bow and sword and was protected only by a cuirass of leather or padded cloth and an open helmet. He received lower pay. In Poland and Hungary the armies were chiefly composed of light cavalry without armour, fighting with the sword or sabre.

That period saw the beginning of a revolution in the art of war. There had always been an infantry wearing a light cuirass and fighting with the bow or the pike (sometimes ending in a hook). They were either men of the people serving for pay or the inhabitants of a town enrolled in the militia, but the part played was only a small one. After the fourteenth century governments were to have in their service an infantry capable of taking a decisive part in battle. In the fourteenth century it consisted of crossbowmen, usually Genoese, and

English or Welsh archers, whose arrows carried a very long way and struck hard. In the fifteenth century it consisted of the Swiss, armed some with a very long pike, others with a halberd, and fighting in a serried body.

The heavy cavalry, which, since the ninth century, had formed the principal strength of an army, could only fight drawn up in a square several ranks deep and charging with the lance. These tactics had sufficed in fighting other bodies of the same sort or a militia composed of ill-trained infantry. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries armies composed of cavalry were disastrously defeated every time they met well-drilled infantry, such as the English archers mingled with dismounted knights (as at Crécy and Poitiers), the sultan's janizaries (as at Nicopolis or Varna), the Hussites armed with flails and scythes, the Swiss (at Sempach, Granson, and Morat). This revolution had nothing to do with the invention of firearms, which had been used as early as 1331. These consisted of arquebuses with a match (or fuse), pistols, and even cannon, but they took too long to discharge and the projectiles were too weak to bring a troop to a standstill, so all battles at that time were decided with side-arms.

Taxation

To pay their armies the kings required more money than was provided by their regular revenue, which consisted of the products of their domain and of those "droits of the crown" known in French as *régales* (royal), supplemented by the *aids* demanded from their vassals. By the end of the thirteenth century the two richest kings, those of France and England, were using new methods. They demanded taxes of their subjects in their whole realm, and these were assessed in various ways, being either a certain proportion of their property other than land or part of the income from their real property. Both of them expelled the Jews and confiscated their property. The king of England levied a very heavy tax on the export of wool and hides.

The subjects of both kings considered these taxes in money unjust and called them by the Latin name of *male tolta* (bad levies). Edward of England promised not to collect any again without "the common consent of the realm" — that is to say, of Parliament. The kings of France preferred to summon an assembly of notables, whether

those of the whole realm or else of a single province, and invoked the feudal right of demanding an *aid* in money "for the needs of the realm." Gradually this taxation became an accepted custom in all countries under different names — in English *subsidy*, in Spanish *servicio*, in German *Steuer*.

With regard to what was to be taxed, governments hesitated between two systems and ended by adopting both. A direct tax was imposed upon land and houses, the original intention having been to levy an amount consisting in a fixed proportion of income or capital. But, unable to estimate this, governments fell back upon an easier plan. They fixed the sum to be paid by every town or village, leaving it to be apportioned among the inhabitants by the local authority, which was held responsible for the payment. This is the origin of what the French call "*impôts de répartition*" (taxes assessed in a lump). The nobles had consented to the levying of taxation, not upon their own lands, but upon those of their tenants. In Hungary and Poland they obtained a declaration exempting them from all taxation.

Indirect taxes upon sales, the principle of which was generally accepted, were first levied upon all sales in the market, as still happens in Spain, where a tax of a tenth exists, known by the Arabic name of *alcavala*. In France it was confined to the sale of articles for which there was a large demand, especially wines and beer in the towns, and the right of collecting it was granted to tax-farmers. The king also farmed out the monopoly of the salt-tax, which continued to bear its Arabic name of *gabelle*. England, where all foreign trade was carried on by sea, adopted the more convenient plan of taxes on the export of wool and hides and the import of wines and brandy.

This taxation, contrary to custom and acquiesced in solely as a temporary necessity, was intended to be provisional, the prince being supposed to meet his own expenditure out of the revenues from his domain. In France this principle was recognized by Charles V, who ordered that taxation should be abolished after his death. But the subjects of the king of France grew accustomed to paying it so regularly that it became permanent and, except in certain provinces, was levied without asking the consent of an assembly. The principle of consent was maintained not only in England, where the custom of summoning Parliament for the purpose still prevailed, but in almost all the German lands, Sweden, and eastern Europe, at least as a matter of form.

Changes in the judicial system

The assembly that had granted taxation for the expenses of the army appointed the agents who were to collect it and pay the soldiers. This system was very soon abandoned in France, but survived in the German lands, where two sets of agents and two treasuries continued to exist side by side, one for the prince's domain and the other, known as the "war chest," for the expenses of the troops.

Changes in the judicial system

While the material power of kings and princes was increasing as the result of taxation and their professional armies, their powers as chief fountain of justice were being strengthened by changes in law and procedure. They did not abolish any of the ancient courts of justice which had tried the different classes of their subjects — the officialities for the clergy, the feudal courts for their vassals, the bourgeois courts for the townsmen, or the domanial (or manorial) courts for the tenants of the domain, but weakened them by having recourse to two methods. They reserved the most important affairs to the royal court of justice, as the king of England had always done. They provided it with powers to hear *appeals* against the sentences of other tribunals and quash them, just as the pope could annul the judgments of an ecclesiastical tribunal from which an appeal had been made to the Roman Curia. Thus a new system became established in every country except England and remained in use all over the Continent, whereby a case might be carried from a lower tribunal to a series of higher ones, and the sentence of the judge in the inferior court quashed by the superior one. The power to take measures for the maintenance of order (distinguished in modern practice under the name of *police*) was still a judicial function; it provided machinery for the arrest and imprisonment of "persons reputed dangerous, thieves, vagabonds, or beggars," and even for their execution without form of trial.

As had happened in Italy, the staff of persons whose duty it was to administer justice came to consist more and more of laymen learned in the law, almost always bourgeois, who, after studying law, entered the government service and became professional judges. A staff of lawyers, advocates, attorneys, registrars, and notaries employed in the conduct of trials or the drafting of contracts grew up in connection with every court, with ushers and serjeants working under them. These were very numerous, especially in France and Italy, but far

less so in Spain, where summary procedure was still the rule, and in the less thickly populated lands of Germany and eastern Europe.

Custom and law

Two different systems of law and procedure prevailed in Europe. The southern lands, Italy, Spain, and the south of France, still used Roman law; the habit of applying rules drawn from the law-books studied since the twelfth century at the University of Bologna was easy for them to accept. A system had grown up in these lands which was no longer based upon the ancient text of the Digest, but on the *glosses* — that is, the commentaries on the text written during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which the jurists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries interpreted in such a way as to adapt them to the practices arising out of the customary and canon law. The greater part of Europe, England and Scotland, France (with the exception of the south), the German and Scandinavian lands, and the eastern kingdoms, adhered to customary law, which consisted in judging cases in the light of the *precedents* — that is, analogous cases of which a record had been preserved (known in English as *case-law*).

The clash between law and custom started as early as the fourteenth century. Governments were at first opposed to Roman law. The king of France forbade it to be taught; the Parlement of Paris, the English and German courts of law rejected it as foreign. Yet it had great practical advantages. Customary law was vague, uncertain, variable, different in different places, and difficult to teach in an age when instruction consisted in reading and commenting upon a written text. Roman law was committed to writing, precise, certain, uniform, and convenient to teach. Those who wished to study law preferred to study Roman law; the universities preferred to teach it. Judges who had taken a degree in law found it easier to apply, all the more since it was in force in the ecclesiastical courts. In Germany the judges became accustomed to consulting the law manuals in use at the universities, and even sought the advice of the professors. During the fifteenth century Roman law began to permeate and to some extent replace the customary law. This change, known in Germany as “the reception of Roman law,” spread to the Catholic kingdoms of eastern Europe.

In England and the Scandinavian lands customary law held its

own. In France the Parlement of Paris still followed it in matters relative to persons — community of property between man and wife, equal division of an inheritance among the children — which passed from customary law into the French Code. Whereas customary law recognized as valid only such agreements as had been made in a solemn form, under Roman law the *contract* was based upon the intention of the contracting parties, confirmed either in a written deed or even by a promise made on oath. Marriage, which was subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, was regarded as a contract based upon the consent of the parties, confirmed by the testimony of two witnesses. In political matters the jurists appealed to the maxim laid down for the benefit of the Roman emperor: “That which is pleasing to the prince has the force of law,” thus recognizing the king’s right to make new laws, often known by the Roman name of *edicts*, which were binding upon all his subjects and uniformly applicable to his whole territory, as the Roman law had been.

Procedure

The adoption of Roman law caused a revolution in procedure. Customary law had been shaped by uneducated men, incapable of grasping an abstract and intangible rule or of understanding a legal process, unless translated into visible acts. It had created a procedure consisting in symbolic acts, the whole of which took place in the presence of the court, with no preliminary preparation or written documents, and took the form of a contest between the two parties to the suit, or in cases of crime between accuser and accused. It consisted in words which had to be pronounced quite correctly and symbolic acts which had to be carried out on pain of losing the case. The judge was assisted by assessors who helped him to “find the judgment,” which meant declaring both what rule was to be applied and what sentence was to be pronounced.

The penalties were a punishment for a definite act, called by a definite name, and did not take into account either the intention with which it had been committed or the circumstances of the case. This principle was carried so far that unintentional homicide was punished by death and a horse or pig might be executed for killing a man. They consisted in corporal punishment (whipping, mutilation, death), fines, and confiscation. The secular authorities had no interest in providing

for the condemned man's maintenance; prisons were used for the detention of prisoners of war till their ransom was paid.

Customary procedure was public, oral, symbolic, and bound up with inflexible rules, and it had to be set in motion through the agency of an individual, the plaintiff or accuser. Roman law replaced this by a secret procedure, written, rational, and flexible, which in civil causes examined the written documents and in criminal cases inquired into the intention. The judge did not wait for an accuser to come forward, but acted *ex officio* (in virtue of his functions), ordered the arrest and imprisonment of the suspect, and opened an investigation (French *enquête* or *instruction*) for the purpose of discovering the truth. His proceedings took place in secret, and in order to obtain a confession he might use torture; when a conviction had been obtained, he pronounced sentence.

All the innovations of this period — the summoning of assemblies, standing armies, taxation, royal courts of justice, appeals, Roman law, and secret procedure — worked together to provide the secular authority with more efficacious methods of keeping its subjects in submission and removing its opponents. Thus the secular authority was gaining in strength while the authority of the Church was growing weaker.

Population

The numbers of the European population are unknown to us. It reached its greatest density in northern Italy and France. An investigation carried out in France in 1328 shows that the population of the country districts was as dense then as in the nineteenth century. In all parts the great plague of 1348 carried off a large number of the inhabitants — a third, or even a half, if contemporary reports are to be credited. The population of England has been estimated at under three million.

Paris, the only great city, seems to have had fewer inhabitants at the end of the fifteenth century than earlier. Only in Italy and Flanders were towns to be found with between forty and fifty thousand: Milan, Naples, Venice, Genoa, Florence, Ghent, and Bruges. With the exception of Nuremberg, the largest towns in Germany scarcely numbered more than twenty thousand inhabitants. The whole of Europe beyond the Elbe was very scantily populated. At the end of the

Technical progress

fifteenth century Russia seems to have had no more than two million inhabitants to its two million square kilometres.

We have no precise information about the birth-rate, which, as now, must have been high in the country districts, where wretchedly poor families lived crowded together in utter promiscuity. But the excess of births over deaths was greatly reduced by the high mortality among infants and by the three scourges of "war, pestilence, and famine." Births were fewer, perhaps, in the towns, where the masters of the guilds were bent upon keeping up the standard of living. The censuses taken in certain towns of Germany show a large number of families with two children.

Technical progress

The material conditions of life were changing as the result of improvements in the implements of labour, which had begun as early as the twelfth century. They were carried farther by the invention of the plane, which made it possible to make pieces of wood smooth and thinner, to groove it and make mouldings, mortices, and tenons, thanks to which it became possible to make much lighter panels for furniture and doors. This marked the beginning of the carpenter's craft and the art of furniture-making. From the fourteenth century dates the clock with weighted pendulum and escapement, an Italian invention. Adopted by more than fifty towns before the end of the fourteenth century, it took the place of the clepsydra, or water-clock, the only kind known since the days of antiquity, thus providing a convenient means of measuring time exactly.

Gunpowder, used in China for fireworks, had been known in Europe since the thirteenth century, but two centuries of tentative attempts were required before practical means were discovered of manufacturing a granular powder with explosive force and inventing a mechanism for casting projectiles. Two mechanisms were in use simultaneously: a short tube which was the origin of both the arquebus with a fuse and the pistol, and a long, thick tube which developed into the cannon.

Paper, which took the place of papyrus while preserving its name, was brought from China by way of Persia to the lands in contact with the Moslems. By the twelfth century it was already being manufactured at Xativa near Valencia in Spain, and by the thirteenth century

at Bologna in Italy. But it seemed too fragile and inferior to parchment, and was expensive, too, for linen rag was scarce. Paper did not come into general use till the fifteenth century, when the use of linen shirts was sufficiently widespread to make rag much more plentiful.

Printing, as already known in Asia, only permitted of the reproduction of a whole page, just as an engraving is reproduced today. It was in Europe that the idea occurred of making separate letters, which were put together to compose a page, but these wooden or leaden letters were crushed in the press. Printing did not become practicable till the middle of the fifteenth century, when a metal alloy was invented in Germany that made it possible to produce type strong enough to resist pressure, while at the same time paper was growing far less expensive.

The magnetic needle pointing towards the north had been known in both Asia and Europe as early as the thirteenth century, but only as a curiosity. It did not become an instrument of practical utility until it was mounted on a pivot in a box. During the fifteenth century the *compass* came into use for providing mariners with a means of finding their direction without needing to see the stars.

Among other instances of technical progress may be mentioned the working of silver mines in the mountains of Bohemia, Saxony, the Tirol, and Hungary since the end of the thirteenth century. This provided an abundance of silver, which was used partly for jewelry and plate and partly for the money required in trade.

It remains to mention those inventions about whose origin little is known: the spinning-wheel, which produced a more regular thread more rapidly than the spindle of antiquity; the lock with two sluice-gates, which made canal navigation more rapid; and the extraction of sugar from sugar-cane, the cultivation of which had been introduced by the Moslems. Used instead of honey, this made confectionery possible, and it was first made in Italy.

Economic life

The organization of production and trade, begun before the fourteenth century, was consolidated and completed by certain new processes. The organization of labour was based upon the rule that the authorities — whether prince, lord, or municipal body — had power to settle all conditions of work. They granted permission for manu-

facture, sales, and transport; they might prohibit all labour, grant to whomsoever they pleased the sole right of manufacturing or selling an article (known as a monopoly), and impose a price fixed by themselves. This power was limited only by custom, and all governments used it to raise funds. The commercial or industrial towns, ruled by their councils, continued to maintain their policy of favouring the inhabitants of the town at the expense of outsiders, securing for consumers a plentiful supply of commodities at a low price, and reserving the profits of industry to the artisans in the towns and those from trade to its merchants. When some outside person did an injury to a citizen of the town, the government took *reprisals* by seizing the property of some other inhabitant of the offender's town.

Princes ruling over a larger territory allowed wider scope for sales and trade between their subjects living in different towns, especially in the southern lands, where the artisans were not organized into guilds. The king of England, possessed of real power which made itself felt in all the towns in his realm, followed a less narrow policy. He refused to allow the people of different towns to treat one another as strangers and forbade reprisals between town and town in England. He issued regulations applying to all of them, just as Magna Carta and the statutes had applied equally to all the king's subjects. He accustomed the English to acknowledging that trade ought to be carried on freely among the subjects of the whole kingdom. Since he required foreigners for importing the luxuries and wines consumed by the nobles, he allowed them to trade freely in England, in spite of customs and charters. There were risings in London against the Italians and the Germans of the Hanse towns.

Production

Agriculture was subject to a fixed routine consisting in the triennial rotation of crops and compulsory cultivation (see Chapter V), which was the rule in France, England, and Germany and was extended to all parts of eastern Europe on the German model. The area of cultivated land increased and new lands were brought under wheat in the new countries, but it was hardly possible to improve methods of cultivation. Moreover, the peasants lacked implements and money, and the idea of innovation did not occur to them. The chief progress took place in certain lands favoured by exceptional conditions: on the

one hand in Lombardy, near the rich towns, and in those parts of Spain which were cultivated by the Moors by means of irrigation canals, where such southern crops were raised as the mulberry, olive, and vine; and on the other hand in Flanders, near the towns and on lands reclaimed from the sea, where farming was not fettered by regulations.

Industry was still organized in guilds. Craftsmen belonging to the same guild usually continued to live in the same street, but each one worked separately in his own workshop. They sold the products of their craft either to the customer who had ordered them or else in the market. The demand was limited, though in normal times secure, for there was a fixed public composed of purchasers settled in the district and in the habit of always ordering the same articles in conformity with custom. The craftsman waited for the customer. The number of craftsmen in a town was small and varied little, for customers were few; as a rule there was not more than one apprentice to every master.

Labour was regulated by a very strong tradition which had developed into a code of morality expressed in sayings which were long current. A craft must "support its man (French, *nourrir son homme*)" and provide him with a livelihood for his family, while leaving his fellow-members a means of subsistence. Each man must live by selling to his usual customers and not try to take away those of a fellow-worker. It was unfair to use a process that would increase the profits of one at the expense of another. The work by which a workman lived was regarded as his property. The German towns forbade the spinning-wheel because it left the women unemployed and the fulling-mill because it deprived many workmen of work. All things had to be sold at a "fair price," which would seem to mean a net price calculated by adding to the cost of the raw material the value of the time spent in labour. A master had to pay his workmen a "fair wage," fixed by custom for every craft in every town, and the workman was not allowed to ask for more. The master had no right to employ his apprentice solely for his own personal profit, but was bound to teach him all the secrets of his craft honestly and supervise his conduct. The craftsman had to work not exclusively with a view to profit, but in such a way as to deliver none but "honest" work (that is, of good quality). The authorities applied rules of labour morality by issuing regulations, fixing compulsory prices, and providing for the inspection of the product.

Businesses manufacturing articles for sale in distant markets developed considerably from the beginning of the fourteenth century onwards, especially in two departments of industry. The new system was applied to metal-work — the armour of Milan and Brescia, Toledo swords, the cutlery of Solingen, and the copper of Dinant — and textiles: the cloth of Florence, of Ghent and Ypres in Flanders, and of Norwich in England, the fine linens of Cambrai and Malines, the silks, brocades, satins, velvets, and cloth of gold and silver of Milan and Genoa. The artisans engaged in their manufacture came to be workmen hired by some other master or merchant. The employer provided them with the raw material, paid them a wage, and sold the product of their labour for his own profit. The cloth-manufacturers, indeed, employed workmen practising various crafts, who were either concentrated in the towns or scattered in the villages. Mining was carried on by an association of miners who extracted the ore and sold it to the manufacturer.

Commerce

Trade was carried on chiefly by sea and had as its principal centres the maritime towns: in Italy Venice and Genoa, which sent their ships to the Levant and the far end of the Black Sea; in Spain Barcelona; and in Flanders Bruges, the port for which the fleet sailed from Italy; in England London; and on the North Sea and the Baltic the German towns of Hamburg, Lübeck, and Danzig, which formed the Hanseatic League, founded for the purpose of defending their ships and maintaining storehouses for their wares, which gave them a monopoly of trade in the northern lands. The overland route starting from Venice crossed the Brenner Pass to the Danube and continued eastwards by way of Prague and Pest and north-eastwards through Breslau and Cracow as far as Riga. To the west it followed the Rhine as far as the Low Countries.

The place of the fairs in Champagne, which had been abandoned during the fourteenth century, was taken by those of Bruges (where the Italians met the Hanseatic merchants), Frankfurt, and later Lyons and Geneva. These cities tried to attract foreign merchants by placing no restrictions upon trade, the townspeople making their profits out of leasing them stores and acting as agents for them or even as hotel-keepers.

The Italian innovations

The articles dealt in were still luxuries: stuffs, textiles, perfumes, and spices brought from the East through Alexandria. There was a far more active trade in raw materials: wood for building, wheat, furs, and tar brought by the Hanseatic League's ships from Scandinavia and as far away as Russia, and wool and sheepskins, the chief exports from England, which by the king's order were concentrated in one or two towns, in order to facilitate collection of the export duties.

Merchants carried on both wholesale and retail trade at the same time. The richest were those of Italy, and in particular of Venice, who possessed a larger working capital, carried on their trade in more densely populated regions, and dealt in the more valuable articles intended for richer customers. In the German towns a merchant would measure, weigh, and pack his own goods; he was often forced to travel with them and had only a small quantity for sale, for he had to buy them out of his own small capital, so that he only obtained a limited profit. Calculations based upon records of the fifteenth century show that the volume of trade was but small. In Hamburg it is estimated at four million francs (200,000 dollars) in one year. The total quantity of wool exported from England in 1377 was three thousand tons.

The Italian innovations

The commercial machinery already evolved in Italy (see Chapter VIII) was increasingly adopted by the European peoples, and with the invention of new modes of procedure progress continued. Merchants were not the only persons engaged in profitable transactions; nobles, rich families, and religious houses invested their funds in various ways devised to evade the prohibition of loans at interest. They would lend them to a property-owner who would pay them a perpetual annuity secured on his house, or to a prince who would give them a domain in pledge instead of as a fief. In the maritime towns they engaged in transactions on a limited partnership basis by lending money to some merchant who was shipping a cargo and sharing his profits.

From the middle of the twelfth century onwards there were two cities with a gold coinage of their own: Florence with its *florins* and Venice with its *ducats*, which were used in their trade with the East. In Europe there was hardly any but silver currency in circulation, which was still debased by those issuing it. Money-changers were still necessary for ascertaining the value of moneys, but they were

beginning more and more to receive deposits and act as bankers. They still carried on their former transactions, issuing letters of credit, effecting transfers, advancing money on the security of goods, and insuring against risks at sea.

In the fourteenth century was invented the bill of exchange, drawn upon a banker or merchant by those having credits with him, the former being bound to pay the sum indicated; and the "protest" in case of non-payment. In the fifteenth century began the practice of pawnbroking, the *mont-de-piété*, or public pawnbroking establishment, being a charitable institution started for lending money at moderate interest upon goods left in pledge, so that it was not necessary to have recourse to a usurer. At this time, too, was created the oldest public bank, the Bank of St. George at Genoa, founded by an association of the town's creditors, who in return for a loan had received the right of collecting certain public revenues, each partner receiving a *share* which might be sold. This is the first example of a transferable security available for sale and providing a means of speculation. At the same time the first commercial *companies* were founded, consisting of a number of merchants, usually of the same family, which was to become the origin of the joint-stock company, as distinguished from its members.

In England, where merchants were all under the direct authority of the king, those who carried on business abroad and stood in need of support had founded an association of "merchants of the realm" before the fourteenth century, referred to by the king in the fifteenth century as "merchants of our realm of England." It did not trade in its own name, but its members agreed among themselves to carry out each transaction in common, each contributing his own wares in various quantities. In the fifteenth century was formed an association of merchants known as *adventurers*, engaged in the export trade.

These transactions, though based on credit, did not as yet constitute a capitalist system, for the merchants had only small sums to work with, and a number of persons were associated in each enterprise. Almost all the money was advanced to princes, lords, or cities and used only for the unproductive purposes of war or luxury; it was not capital employed in production. The saying was that: "No man may buy a herring that is still uncaught or cloth that is not yet woven."

It was in Italy, too, that the new processes of calculation and ac-

countancy were evolved. The Roman numerals, which alone were used in Europe, made all complicated calculations very difficult. Reckoning was carried out either with an abacus, or ball-frame, or with counters on a chequered tablecloth, as in England; hence mediæval accounts often contain mistakes. The use of the "Arabic numerals," which expedited multiplication and addition by the introduction of the figure nought, started towards the end of the fifteenth century in a few towns and was at first forbidden. It made but slow progress up to the end of the fifteenth century, and only in Italy. It was there that schools sprang up for teaching the art of calculation. In the sixteenth century Germans were still going to Italy to learn arithmetic. At the same time the art of keeping accounts was in process of formation. At first only a notebook was used in which purchases and sales were jumbled together. The common fund subscribed by partners was used not only for their commercial transactions, but also for their personal expenditure. It was not till the end of the fifteenth century that book-keeping by double entry appeared, and then only in Italy.

The peasants

Society was still based upon the division into classes which had come into being as early as the twelfth century, but within these classes a tendency to subdivision had appeared. The lower class in every country was still composed of tillers of the soil living in the country, those living in the towns being reckoned as bourgeois. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries their position underwent a change in two opposite directions. In the most populous countries, Italy, France, England, and western Germany, they continued in general to improve their position by the redemption of feudal dues and the commuting of forced labour for a money payment. The hereditary tenants established in France and Germany became owners of their land, owing their lord dues, which were inconvenient rather than onerous. Most of the serfs became free men. But in France their burdens were greatly increased owing to the new taxation imposed by the king. The German peasants profited by the increase of wealth in money. In England freeholders or holders of a long lease became independent. Those in the most comfortable circumstances formed a class of *yeomen* intermediate between peasants and gentlemen. The sole right

The townspeople

acquired by *copyholders* — that is, those who had no formal right to their land, but held it only by custom — was that of leaving it, and the lord often tried to increase his income by raising the dues. The revolts which broke out in the south of England in 1382, and a century later in the west of Germany, seem to have been occasioned by an arbitrary increase of these burdens.

Below the peasants who owned some land came a probably growing mass of manual labourers who acted as hired day-labourers, mainly employed in seasonal labour. It was for the purpose of preventing these men from profiting by the scarcity of labour that the English Government fixed a maximum wage after the Great Plague. The mode of life of the peasants remained in general rough and poor. Some, however, who were more favourably situated, profited by the technical progress that had been made and the more abundant supply of money to obtain a little comfort, and were reproved in Germany for spending sums on food and clothing that were above their station.

In the east European lands the German colonists introduced by the princes had obtained their land on a hereditary tenure in return for quite a small quitrent and enjoyed a superior standard of living. But the native peasants, speaking a Slav or Balt language, became increasingly liable to arbitrary dues and forced labour and were abandoned to the caprice of German lords. In Poland the nobles even obtained from the kings the power of being sole judge over the peasants on their domain, known as *kmiecy*, who became serfs attached to the soil and subject to arbitrary dues. In Russia, where a large proportion of the land was covered with forests or marshes, the peasants had originally settled on the narrow strip of arable land in small groups consisting of the same family. They were free before the law, but to pay the tribute due to the Tatar khan the princes imposed a money due upon them which became a permanent charge. The fighting men also employed slaves in the cultivation of their lands, who seem to have been prisoners of war, especially in the central region subject to the prince of Moscow.

The townspeople

The inhabitants of the towns formed an intermediate class between the mass of peasants occupying an inferior status and the privileged

The townspeople

minority of the nobles, which was constantly increasing in number, wealth, consideration, and power. In the small towns and walled villages (*bourgs*) a great many of them were free farmers disposing of their land at will, and the vine-growers were even organized into a guild.

The inequality which began to appear during the thirteenth century between the mass of manual workers, craftsmen and tillers of the soil and the minority composed of professions exempt from manual toil continued to increase, especially in the richer towns of Italy and France. Even within the craft guilds the inequality between masters and journeymen grew more trying. The masters had made rules with the object of securing their own places for their sons or sons-in-law; admission to mastership had been burdened by the condition, from which sons of masters were exempted, of paying a high fee and presenting a "master-piece" — that is to say, a piece of work made by the candidate's own hands and, in some guilds, of considerable value.

Those journeymen who did not succeed in becoming masters remained hired workers in the service of an employer all their lives. They tried to form journeymen's associations with the object of forcing the masters to raise wages or improve their conditions of work. They would come to an agreement among themselves to refuse to work for some particular master or even to stop work all at the same time, which was known in France as "*faire grève*" (going on strike). In the fifteenth century there was founded in France the *compagnonnage* (trade union), which united in one association all journeymen working at the same craft throughout the whole country. They held secret meetings and went from town to town, welcomed by the other members, who helped them find work. This custom, known as making the "*tour de France*" (going the round of France), was also practised in Germany. In England guilds of journeymen were formed in the fifteenth century which held meetings and arranged strikes. A similar inequality grew up in those crafts in which masters worked for a contractor and were reduced to the status of hired workmen.

From the mass of *bourgeois*, in the original sense of the word (a sense still borne by *burgess* in English and *Bürger* in German), there ultimately split off a privileged minority which alone has continued to be known by the name of *bourgeois* in France. It included land-owners and householders, lawyers (judges, advocates, attorneys, reg-

istrars and notaries), and the members of all professions offering greater opportunities of enrichment because they partake more of the nature of trade than of industry: shipowners, bankers and employers hiring labour, especially cloth-manufacturers, as well as apothecaries, gold- and silver-smiths, grocers, and mercers. In London the king recognized the right of twelve companies to wear a distinctive uniform (*livery*). The richest families were to be found in the towns of Italy and southern Germany, where they had made fortunes in overseas trade, banking, and cloth-manufacture. Most of them were of Italian origin, even when residing out of Italy.

The rule of conduct for a bourgeois was to live according to custom, behave with simple propriety as a bourgeois should, and suit his expenditure to his resources, setting aside a surplus which constituted his savings. Thus the bourgeois families grew wealthier, but sometimes without increasing their numbers, for they would retire from trade, buy a nobleman's domain, and become merged in the nobility. In Germany, where the nobles refused to admit rich families into their society, they formed an urban aristocracy which assumed the name of *patricians*, drawn from antiquity.

The separation between the privileged classes and the masses led to violent conflicts, especially in the towns with sovereign rights, where no higher authority had power to intervene between the opposing sides. In Italy there was a war between the "major" and "minor arts," or guilds; as early as the fourteenth century the craftsmen of the "minor arts" obtained the right to have a leader of their own, the *capitano del popolo* (captain of the people) and take part in the government. In the fifteenth century there was a struggle in Germany between the patricians and the guilds (*Zünfte*), which ended in the admission of the guilds to power. Within the guilds, too, there were revolts of journeymen against the masters. The most famous of these was that of the *ciompi* (companions) at Florence in 1382, led by a journeyman carder, and there were others in the towns of Flanders and at Barcelona and Valencia in Spain. The authorities everywhere sided with the masters, forbade meetings of workmen, and fixed a maximum wage. Striking was classed as sedition and punished by death.

The nobles

Fighting men still formed the upper class, which included even the princes and the king. All mounted esquires and in eastern Europe all mounted warriors had gained admission to it, and all had begun to be called nobles. But this system was upset over a large part of Europe by a new method of recruiting armies which now came into force. In England, where the king had ceased to require military service of his vassals, even the knights ceased to possess arms, and the king issued ordinances compelling the richest landowners to take up their knighthood. The name *nobles* was reserved to those lords who were the king's direct vassals. All the rest became indistinguishably blended in a class of *squires* or *gentlemen*, whose status ceased to be hereditary. The distinction between owners of fiefs bound to do service in war and free tenants, or *yeomen*, became less marked. The position of gentleman no longer depended upon birth, but was acquired through landed property and education. The son of a yeoman might become a gentleman.

In other countries nobility remained hereditary. Gentlemen formed a class which was closed to men not of noble birth. They had privileges before the law which were recognized by kings and courts of justice and which were hereditary. Nobles alone were admitted to the king's court and high honours; they had the right to special marks of distinction on ceremonial occasions and to favoured treatment before the law. In those lands of eastern Europe where the feudal system had not been introduced, the mass of warriors serving as mounted soldiers when the levy in mass was called up had become a hereditary aristocracy. In Poland it sufficed for a man to own a horse, arms, and a small freehold for him to belong to the *szlachta*. Some were so poor that they were nicknamed the "barefoot nobility." But the king had recognized the same privileges as belonging to them all: immunity from taxation, the right to take part in the assemblies which elected the judges and deputies (*nuntii*). When Lithuania was united to Poland, the warriors, hitherto treated by the prince as servants of whom he could dispose at will, became assimilated to the Polish nobles and ultimately enjoyed the same privileges. The system was the same in Hungary, where the warriors constituting the levy in mass elected the assembly of the *comitatus* (county). In Russia the

warrior class, originally consisting of the *boyars* (great landowners) and the princes' bodyguards, greatly increased in number when the prince introduced men of servile origin into it, like the German *Dienstmannen*, and granted them each a domain for life, known from the fifteenth century onwards by the name of *pomiestie*, from which comes the *pomiestchik* by which the nobles have been known up to modern times.

In spite of its common origin, the nobility became increasingly divided up into different kinds, distinguished from one another by their wealth, mode of life, and manners. The great majority of them continued to live in the country, in a castle or manor, occupied in riding and hunting and behaving towards the peasants like masters. Since paid armies had become general, nobles who took service in them became professional warriors, going from one country to another in quest of adventures.

The richer nobles had begun, like those of Italy, to spend part of their time in the towns, where they owned a residence and frequented the prince's court. Their mode of life had changed. They spent their wealth in leading a life of luxury, on the model of the Italian courts. This luxury, which contemporaries found so striking, was displayed in a multitude of ornaments, costly stuffs, furs, silver plate, and highly decorated furniture. It was in this court society that the extravagant fashions indignantly denounced by preachers made their appearance — the shoes with long, pointed toes "*à la poulaine*" (that is, in the Polish fashion), the high, pointed hennin and the extremely low-necked dresses worn by the ladies. Now for the first time in the world's history, instead of the ancient group dances or the round dances of the Middle Ages, accompanied by song, the fashion came in of dancing in couples, when a lady and her partner detached themselves hand-in-hand from the mass of dancers. Those were the days of balls, masquerades, and tournaments, at which the knights fought with "*armes courtoises*" (courtly — that is, blunted — weapons), and the victor received "the prize" from the hands of a lady, as in the romances of chivalry. These were also the days of enormous banquets broken by "interludes" in the form of allegorical representations, and of public rejoicings on the occasion of the marriage of a prince or his solemn entry, when the whole population of a town

The clergy

was invited to admire a procession at which the whole court appeared in splendid attire.

The nobles made it a rule not to regulate their expenditure according to their means, but by what seemed to them befitting their rank. The result was a deficit, which they met by borrowing or other expedients. Since honour forbade them any gainful occupations, the noble families became impoverished and ran into debt, while the bourgeois were enriching themselves by saving and by lending money on goods pledged to them.

The enriched bourgeois tried to raise themselves to the position of the nobility, and from the fourteenth century onwards the sovereigns assumed the power of creating knights and nobles. They used this power to reward the bourgeois who lent them money or performed legal and financial functions from which nobles were disqualified. The emperor, the kings, and certain princes began granting or selling patents of nobility which conferred all the privileges of a nobleman on the "ennobled" man and his descendants. The nobility was now coming to be recruited not from the warriors, but from the bourgeois families in the towns.

The clergy

The clergy had not modified the rules which set them apart from the secular world. But they had benefited by the increase in wealth. The number of ecclesiastics had increased, especially in the towns, where pious foundations and the houses of the mendicant orders, especially the Franciscans, were becoming more numerous, growing numbers of ecclesiastics were teaching at the universities or colleges, and more of those in minor orders were employed in clerical work.

As commodities grew more plentiful, the life of the clergy had grown more comfortable and they were gradually coming to neglect their office for the sake of their benefice, the value of which was now higher, so that it came to be a means of living without working. The higher offices of bishop and abbot were almost all occupied by the younger sons of great seignorial families. Some of them, indeed, had come to hold several offices at a time by means of a dispensation. The name of *canon* came to denote a life of idle plenty. Religious zeal had grown slack, not only among the monks of the older orders

established in the country, where they passed their lives like land-owners, chiefly engaged in administering their domains, but also among the new orders in the towns. Even the Franciscans ceased to be popular and were censured for allowing themselves to be supported by the alms of the faithful while they led a lazy and disorderly life. Discipline among the clergy had possibly been shaken by the crisis of the Great Schism and the failure of the attempts at reform by the councils.

Religion

Religious ardour found its chief expression in the towns in the person of individuals inspired by a deep faith, and this expression took new forms. At the end of the fourteenth century some new saints appeared: St. Yves of Tréguier, St. Bridget of Sweden, St. Catherine of Siena. Finding no satisfaction in either worship or doctrine, the sense of the divine sought the way of *mysticism* properly so called — that is, the aspiration of the soul seeking communion with God. The masters of this mystical life were monks living in the German towns on the Rhine or in the Netherlands and writing in German or Flemish. In the fourteenth century the Dominican Eckhardt said: "The soul finds union with God through renunciation and contemplation." In the fifteenth century Thomas of Kempen (Thomas à Kempis) composed a Latin book, the *Imitation of Christ*, which made the deepest impression upon the faithful. Mystical contemplation was combined with the mode of life known as "the devout life," which consisted in charitable work on behalf of the sick and poor in addition to religious practices. It was the need that was felt for religious activities that gave birth to the *confraternities*. As early as the end of the thirteenth century there were the Béguines in Flanders, who lived by their own work in small houses, but went out into the town sewing, washing, and caring for the sick, and in the fifteenth century the "Brothers of the Common Life," who were engaged in teaching and preaching. Piety was disseminated among the people in the towns by translations of the Bible into the vernacular, illustrated prayer-books, and religious songs in the vulgar tongue.

Religious sentiment also found an outlet in heresies, which were in conflict with established authority. In spite of the crusade against it, the ancient heresy of the Cathars, which had been exterminated in

France in the fourteenth century, survived in the Slav lands to the east of the Adriatic and had the support of the Prince of Bosnia. The one with the most momentous consequences was based upon a theological doctrine and strengthened by the indignation that was felt against the conduct of the clergy, and it began in England. Wycliffe, a professor at the University of Oxford, deduced from the text of St. Paul the doctrine of salvation by grace (which was later taken up by Luther) and drew the conclusion that the Christian has no other head than Christ and does not require the intervention of the clergy. He rejected everything that he did not find in the Scriptures: the authority of the pope and prelates, confession, the cult of the saints, and indulgences; and he condemned the wealth of the clergy. He translated the Latin Bible into English and sent poor priests to preach among the people and edify them by their example. His doctrine, which was condemned by the Church, was carried to the University of Prague and there taught by a Czech professor, John Hus, supported by the national sentiment of the Czech people against the German clergy. His condemnation by the Council of Constance led to a long war and the creation of a Czech national church.

Learning, literature, and the arts

The authorities in all the Catholic lands, with the exception of Italy, began to found universities on the model of that of Paris, under the direction of the clergy and devoted to the study of religion and philosophy. They all had *colleges* attached to them for the use of poor students called "bursars" (French *boursiers*). These were subject to monastic discipline and engaged in the preliminary study of Latin. During the fifteenth century independent schools were founded, kept by independent masters, especially in the towns of the Netherlands and the lower Rhine.

Instruction, confined within the narrow limits of a commentary upon ancient books, left no room for the free exercise of the intelligence. The faculties of theology and arts (philosophy) confined themselves to handing on a doctrine which had hardened into a rigid system, thanks to scholasticism. The faculties of medicine drew all their learning from the works of Galen. The Latin schools taught grammar from the works of authors belonging to the decadent period. The universities became centres of resistance to all innovation. But

in contrast with the instruction given by ecclesiastics, an intellectual education grew up at princes' courts, especially in Italy, due to reading the pagan authors of antiquity and, still more, the romances of love and adventure. This appealed to those ignorant of Latin, the young nobles and ladies and the rich bourgeois, and infused into the aristocracy a morality at times opposed to that of the clergy, for it exalted courtly manners, courtly love, devotion to a lady, and gallantry and set up an ideal far removed from the coarse manners of the day. Thus arose a new form of culture, supple and gracious, in contrast with the awkwardness of university pedants, and displayed in the new custom of conversation with ladies; it was to reach its ideal in Italy in the shape of the "courtier."

Literature had been transformed by the use of the mother tongue, which at last gave the writer a means of expressing his feelings in a spontaneous form. First used in France, it spread to Italy, Spain, England, and Germany, where the national literary languages were in process of formation as early as the fourteenth century, while eastern Europe still continued to write nothing but Latin. In the fourteenth century it was in Italy that the great original works appeared, which had already approached perfection in the two literary forms which predominated up to the end of the fifteenth century: lyrical poetry and the short story in prose. The writers of all these came from Florence: Dante, whose poem, though epic in form, is lyrical in its inspiration; the poet Petrarch, and Boccaccio, the writer of short stories. In England the first original writer was Chaucer, a story-teller; in France the original works were the chronicles of historians, those of the short-story writers of the Netherlands and the lyrical pieces of Charles d'Orléans and Villon. The theatre was still in its first clumsy beginnings, in the religious form of the *mysteries*, or representations of sacred scenes. The place of the epic had been taken by the prose romance of adventures, the most popular type of which was *Amadis of Gaul*.

Architecture had already produced masterpieces and now sought to embellish them by an abundance of ornament. By the fourteenth century the Gothic style was developing into the "flamboyant." Its most beautiful works were civic buildings, town halls, bell-towers, and the mansions of the great lords. It continued to produce such works in abundance up to the end of the fifteenth century. Sculpture

became separated from architecture in the novel type of tomb created by sculptors from the Netherlands and perfected at the end of the fifteenth century by French artists. By the end of the thirteenth century painting was shaking off the Byzantine tradition and beginning the direct representation of life. It rose from the status of mere decoration when it took the form of the altar-piece. But it did not put forth its full strength till the middle of the fifteenth century, thanks to a step in technical progress, the invention of oil-painting, which was used simultaneously in Flanders and in Italy and already marked the beginning of the Renaissance.

THE BEGINNING OF MODERN TIMES

•

Towards the end of the fifteenth century began the period generally called *modern*. It opened with two crises of an exceptional kind, one æsthetic and superficial, known as the *Renaissance*, which affected only a small minority; the other religious and profound, which affected the whole population and transformed their lives, known as the *Reformation*.

The Renaissance

The term *Renaissance*, used only since 1830, arose out of the false idea that the arts had been dead since the days of antiquity and had come to life again in the sixteenth century. As a matter of fact the arts had been producing beautiful works since the twelfth century and had no need to be reborn. The men of the Middle Ages had not ceased to admire the writers of antiquity. What was new in the plastic arts was that progress in technique which provided the means of producing perfect works; in literature it was the new intention with which the ancients were now studied. During the Middle Ages works had been read with a view to their content, so as to acquire the knowledge of the ancients, who were regarded as the masters of all learning. After the Renaissance the ancients were regarded as masters in the arts and their works as models of form to be imitated. The Renaissance might be defined as the moment at which the arts began to learn the lessons of antique form and attained their highest pitch of perfection.

The Renaissance occurred in every department of art and in most

European countries, but at different periods, its progress across Europe having lasted for two centuries, from the middle of the fifteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth.

The Renaissance of the arts started in two independent centres, Florence in Italy and Bruges in the Netherlands, both of them commercial cities in which the enriched bourgeois had a taste for artistic luxury and provided artists with a means of livelihood. In Flanders art remained the handmaid of religion and continued to treat religious subjects as in the Middle Ages, but painters produced the impression of a new art, thanks to the process of oil-painting and a naïve perfection of detail. In Italy artists purposely broke with tradition and imitated the works of antiquity. Architects rejected that French art which they contemptuously called "Gothic," or barbarous, and revived the forms of Roman art, the plain (*uni*) façade, the pediment, the cupola, the column engaged in the wall, or pilaster, the flat roof, and used them on palaces and churches. Sculpture reverted to the forms, processes, and subjects of antiquity. Painting continued its technical progress, due to a knowledge of perspective, which had still been imperfect in the fifteenth century, and to the study of human anatomy. It reached its perfection at the beginning of the sixteenth century in Milan, Florence, and Rome simultaneously, with Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, and Raphael, who still treated religious subjects, but in forms inspired by antiquity. In Germany the Renaissance of the arts chiefly affected painting and very soon stopped. It was introduced into France by the importation of Italian masterpieces, and in architecture, sculpture, and the art of cabinet-making was retarded by the traditions of French artists, who for half a century preserved in their works a considerable admixture of the more supple and living Gothic forms.

Free from the domination of any antique model, painting remained the most original and varied of the arts, and the most fruitful in great works. The Renaissance held its own for a long time and spread over a wider field by assuming a special character in every land. It reached its height in Venice during the second half of the sixteenth century with Titian, in Flanders during the first half of the seventeenth century with Rubens, in Spain with Velásquez, in France with Poussin, and finally in Holland with Rembrandt and Ruysdael. The influence of the antique upon it was shown in a taste for mythological subjects and allegories, and particularly by the representation

of the nude, which had become infrequent during the Middle Ages. Painters were increasingly led back to the study of nature through portraiture, landscape-painting, and scenes from contemporary life.

The reaction of the antique upon literature took place in two forms: the study of the works of antiquity, known as *humanism*, and the creation of original works inspired by the ancients.

Humanism had started as early as the fifteenth century in Italy, where a few lovers of the antique had begun an ardent search for the works of the Latin authors. It also extended to the Greek authors, the manuscripts of whose writings were brought to Italy by the Greeks attending the Council that met at Florence in 1430 for the purpose of reconciling their Church with that of Rome. Next the Italian humanists edited, translated, and wrote commentaries upon the Latin and Greek writers. They adopted them as models, contemptuously rejecting the scholastic Latin of the universities, and composed poems, speeches, and histories in a Latin copied from the ancients, and especially from Cicero. Their works had a very great vogue at the time. During the sixteenth century humanism, in the form of erudition, found its way first into Germany and then into France, and was also applied to Greek and Hebrew. Learned men took the texts of authors which for fifteen centuries had been corrupted by the errors of copyists and worked at restoring the true text and grasping its real meaning.

In the fifteenth century the Italians, who as early as the fourteenth had created original works in a modern language, yielded to the fashion of writing in Latin. They returned to Italian in the epics of Ariosto and Tasso, whose subjects were drawn from the literary tradition of the Middle Ages. In France the attempt of Ronsard and the poets of the "Pléiade" to adapt the literary forms of antiquity, the epic, tragedy, and comedy, in a French guise, were an utter failure. The original works of Rabelais and Montaigne carried on the French tradition of the Middle Ages, while enriching it with ideas drawn from antiquity, and it may be maintained that the Renaissance in France lasted down to Malherbe and Corneille. It did not take place in England till the end of the sixteenth century, with the plays of Shakespeare, and in Spain with Cervantes.

Music had already been provided with new resources by the progress of the church organ and, in the fifteenth century, by the invention

tion." During the fifteenth century many attempts had been made to reform the Church — that is, to restore it — but none of them had succeeded. In every land a persistent impression prevailed that the clergy were leading a life contrary to their rules, and required to be brought back to them. We have no means of ascertaining whether the clergy had grown more lax than at other periods or the faithful more alive to their abuses. They had certainly grown wealthier, and since society was now less ignorant, the clergy were less in a position to satisfy it. The heads of the Church, the bishops and abbots, were men of noble birth, living in the style of great lords and taking very little interest in their subordinates, the priests or monks; nor had they founded any establishments for the training of priests. The parish priests, chosen by a lay patron, received no education and therefore did not preach or give instruction to the faithful.

Those ecclesiastics who were interested in religion found no guidance and tried to discover the true doctrine at random, even in heretical books, so it might easily happen that they were propagating heterodox opinions. When heresy became organized into a church, a large number of Protestant pastors had formerly been parish priests or monks. The faithful, having received no religious instruction, were often led astray by the hope of discovering the true doctrine through reading the Holy Scriptures in the translations brought within their reach by printing. Supervision by the authorities had become less zealous. The Inquisition was introduced into Spain by the kings before the end of the fifteenth century, but mainly for the purpose of proceeding against converted Jews and Moslems. In Germany the Pope created a special commission in 1484, chiefly for the prosecution of witches, who were accused of worshipping Satan. But the ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals had relaxed their heresy-hunting.

The discontented elements voiced a variety of complaints. They censured the clergy for leading idle lives of wealth and luxury, and sometimes for the licence of their morals and their haughty manners, thanks to which their life had grown similar to that of the laity and no longer conformed to the ideal of poverty, chastity, and humility. They considered that ecclesiastics had too much land, enjoyed unjust exemption from taxation, and had too wide a jurisdiction over the laity. They blamed the pope and his court for imposing excessive taxes upon

both clergy and laity in all countries and giving preferential treatment to Italians in the matter of benefices, thus drawing money from other countries for the benefit of Italy. The anger that was felt was due to three feelings: moral indignation at the vices of the clergy, the political opposition of the secular governments to any competition in power and wealth, and national resentment of exploitation by Italians.

But anger was not enough to carry out a reformation; acts were necessary. It originated in a theological controversy, which led to a political revolution. Theology was a domain reserved to the clergy, but the doctrine of the Church contained one article affecting all believers, for it concerned the most urgent of all practical personal interests: the means by which the Christian might secure his salvation after death and avoid the eternal punishment of hell. Everyone agreed in recognizing the Church as the sole institution through which salvation could be attained. But it worked by means of two agencies: firstly, belief (*faith*), and secondly, religious practices and sacraments (*works*). It was therefore necessary to find out which was the really efficacious procedure if the Christian was to be acquitted by the tribunal of God on the day of judgment and exempted from the punishment of hell. The question, stated in theological terms, was as follows: how is justification to be obtained — by faith or works? This could not be answered until the question of method had been decided: how is the true doctrine revealed by Christ discovered? Is it handed down in the tradition taught by the Church? Or must it be sought through study of the sacred books in which revelation is directly expressed?

The humanists, accustomed to the direct study of original texts, applied this method to the Hebrew and Greek originals of the Holy Scriptures and drew from this procedure a doctrine based upon St. Paul's Epistles. In this sense the Reformation is the daughter, not of the Renaissance, but of humanism, its doctrine having originally been formulated by Hellenists, independent of the world of theologians. The Reformation began not in Italy, where the pagan spirit of the Renaissance predominated, but among two peoples in which the religious sense was strongest, the Germans and the French.

Any theological reform was faced by one very solid obstacle, the still very powerful authority of the clergy. The learned, literary

humanists tried to reform doctrine without any breach with authority. This was the attitude of the most famous of them, Erasmus, a Dutchman who had taught in England.

It was the influence of this theological controversy upon the mass of the people that led to a decisive crisis, for, unlike the Renaissance, it was not concerned with æsthetic subjects, which have never interested more than a minority, but with personal salvation, which profoundly affected the whole people. The struggle was begun by theologians steeped in the text of St. Paul's writings and believing themselves to have returned to the state of mind of the Christians of the first century, which was irreconcilable with the habits adopted by the Church during the lapse of fifteen centuries. They resolved to effect a reformation by a revolt against the pope.

This revolt was an act of desperation and had not the slightest chance of success. Since the fourteenth century the clergy had had at their disposal a machinery for supervision and repression from which no group of heretics had escaped, and all of them had been exterminated. If a Church was to be successfully organized in opposition to that of Rome, it was not enough to find a theologian determined upon braving the pope. There must also be a secular government prepared to let him set up a heretical Church on its territory and prepared, too, to defend it against the governments faithful to Rome. The powerful kings of England, France, and Spain were masters of the clergy in their realm and had no interest in supporting a revolt, so that at first all of them sided with the regular authority of the Church. All those in revolt set up their Church in a land nominally dependent upon the emperor, but where the real power belonged to an independent local government: Luther on the territory of the Elector of Saxony, Zwingli in Zürich, an independent city, Calvin in Geneva, a city allied with the Swiss. If, after the foundation of separate Churches, the new doctrine was to be propagated in other countries, an exceptional concatenation of events was required to prevent the powerful sovereigns from stopping the propaganda. What saved the Reformation and made it possible for it to spread was that for forty years (from 1521 to 1559) the sovereigns in a position to crush it, the Emperor and the King of France, were almost incessantly at war with each other and at odds with the Pope.

The leaders of the revolt

The open revolt took place simultaneously under two forms: that of a doctrinal rupture giving rise to the still existing separate Churches, and that of a popular revolt which was crushed and has left only feeble traces behind it. The theological reform was carried out by three men, all of them belonging to the clergy: Luther, a German monk, Zwingli, a Swiss parish priest, and Calvin, a Frenchman wearing the tonsure. All followed the same method: the study of the sacred texts of St. Paul, which led them all to reject tradition as a distortion of revealed truth. They were different in both sentiment and character, and each organized his Church on different lines.

Luther, the son of a miner, a poor man of the people with coarse manners, who had lived on alms in order to pursue his studies, had become an Augustinian monk and professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg, founded by the Elector of Saxony. His lecture notebooks on the Epistles of Paul for the year 1512 prove that his doctrine had already taken shape before the famous quarrel over the indulgences. It was based upon the idea that the Christian is *justified* — that is, set free from original sin and admitted to salvation — not by his “justice,” his good conduct, or religious practices, but solely through the “grace of God,” granted only to those who have *faith* (*fides*) — that is, the confidence of being saved through the action of Christ. But Luther, a passionate, violent man, subject to fits of melancholy, had acquired a personal certainty of salvation by a mystical process which he called a “sudden illumination,” a direct manifestation of God. This assurance gave him strength to push his doctrine to its extreme consequences. Convinced that salvation can only be attained by the personal feeling of faith and that doctrine is revealed only through Scripture, he rejected everything derived from tradition as idolatry. He abolished not only all devotional practices, but also all the sacraments, with the exception of baptism and the Communion, which he interpreted in such a way as to abolish the sacrifice of the Mass. He rejected the authority of the pope, whom he declared to be Antichrist.

Luther appealed to the laity, and especially to the nobles, against the authority of the pope of Rome by a pamphlet in German addressed

to "the nobility of the German nation," with the object of rousing German national sentiment against the foreigner. Having been excommunicated by the Pope, he committed an act of public revolt by burning the bull of excommunication in the presence of the students. Having been cited by the Emperor before the assembly of the princes, he refused to retract, and the Emperor ordered his writings to be burned and his adherents arrested. He was saved from the fate of all heretics by his prince, who had him carried off and hidden in a castle.

Zwingli inclined towards humanism and was prepared to admit that virtuous pagans such as Marcus Aurelius might be saved. His doctrine, which took shape before that of Luther, was based exclusively upon the Scriptures and condemned all the ritual of worship as idolatrous.

Calvin, the son of a well-to-do bourgeois and employed at one of the ecclesiastical courts, had studied law and Greek before he became acquainted with the writings of Luther. He based a similar doctrine upon the same texts, but gave it the rigour of a juridical system. Threatened with arrest as a heretic, he fled abroad, where he spent the rest of his life. He took as the sole basis of religion the word of God as expressed in the Scriptures. He would not admit of salvation save by the grace of God and through faith in the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ for man's salvation. But going beyond Luther, he laid stress upon *predestination*: God has chosen the *elect* and the reprobate (*réprouvés*) "from all eternity" by an act of pure grace with which the merit of the elect has nothing to do. Hence a man's acts can do nothing to change this decision. It might be thought that the Christian, convinced that his conduct can have no effect whatsoever upon his salvation, would no longer obey any moral laws, but would abandon himself freely to his passions. But Calvin and his disciples arrived in practice at quite a different conclusion. They thought that if a man behaved badly it was because God was abandoning him to his own evil tendencies, and regarded his bad conduct as a sign that he was rejected by God. Hence the believer was led by indirect means to behave well, not so that he might acquire a positive right to salvation, but to escape from the feeling that if he behaved badly, he was one of the damned. Believing, like Luther, that revelation is contained exclusively in the sacred books, Calvin rejected as a corruption of the pure word of God all that he did not find in the Scriptures, all doctrines and

The Protestant churches

practices established during the Middle Ages, and the whole organization of the Church, pope, monks, and bishops.

Other revolts, which took a popular form, were led by priests or monks who professed various doctrines but were all upheld by a mystic sense of receiving inspiration direct from God. They appealed to the peasants and artisans and preached a revolt not only against the clergy, but also against the princes and lords, whom they accused of oppressing the people. They were confused together by their opponents under the common name of *Anabaptists*, because they rejected infant baptism, as unknown to the Holy Scriptures, and baptized adults. They called themselves *Baptists*.

The Protestant churches

None of those in revolt desired to found a separate Church; they all considered themselves the only true Christians and claimed to be reforming the universal Church, by asking the secular authorities to use force in case of need. But since they met with opposition from the authorities, they were obliged to found separate Churches, for which purpose they had to set up a new system of worship, religious instruction, discipline, and relations with the secular government. Since they were not all working under the same conditions, they did not succeed in founding a single reformed Church, but set up a number of mutually conflicting ones.

The revolutionaries wished to create independent communities living apart from the world, which they despised, and having no relations with the secular authority. Every commune chose its own pastor, who was to preach the Gospel purified of all human additions. The believer had to lead an austere life purged of all luxury, dress simply, and refuse to take an oath or bear arms. This revolution was accompanied by the destruction of churches and images and sometimes by violence against the nobles. Between 1505 and 1535 it spread rapidly among the peasants in southern Germany and in the towns of Switzerland and the Netherlands as far as Westphalia. It was violently censured by Luther and Calvin and crushed by the secular princes. A few small pacific communities survived which vegetated obscurely in Holland and played a part in the English Revolution in the sixteenth century, at the time of the Commonwealth. On being transplanted to America, they acquired a powerful influence there.

Luther organized the “*Evangelical*” Church in Germany, on the territory of his protector, the Prince Elector of Saxony. He would have liked to admit to it none but zealous Christians, animated by faith in Jesus Christ, but he renounced this ideal and resigned himself to allowing the mass of nominal Christians to enter it, while subjecting them to a common discipline which was afterwards imposed by the Prince upon all subjects in his territory. He kept some of the forms of the old worship, the vestments, the altar in the churches, and the formula of exorcism in baptism. But he abolished the Mass and Latin liturgy and reduced worship to the sermon, prayers, and hymns in the vulgar tongue. As regards organization, he preserved a grade superior to that of priest, the “superintendent,” with the functions of a bishop, but abolished the celibacy of priests.

This system was adopted by almost all the secular princes and governing bodies of the free cities in Germany, which took advantage of it to confiscate the domains of the Church and abolish the ecclesiastical courts. The Church became dependent upon the Government, and the priest became an official. At first, embarrassed by his wars with the King of France and the Sultan, the Emperor allowed every prince to regulate worship on his territory provisionally, pending the council which was to carry out the reform. When he gave orders for the sentence against Luther to be executed, certain of the princes protested. This is the origin of the name *Protestants*, afterwards applied to all Churches in opposition to Rome. In 1530 they next presented to the Emperor at Augsburg their “confession of faith,” which has remained the official statement of the doctrine of the *Evangelical* (Lutheran) Church. In 1555, after complicated disputes, the provisional regulation of 1526 was made final for all princes and towns “adhering” to the Confession of Augsburg. This system, which gave the secular government the sole power to regulate the religion of its subjects, was adopted by the kings of Sweden and Denmark and by the colonies of Germans scattered through Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic lands.

Calvin organized the “*Reformed Church*” outside France in Geneva, a French-speaking town and republic in alliance with the Swiss, where the old religion had recently been suppressed, with the assistance of Berne, by a French refugee named Farel, a disciple of Lefebvre of Étampes. Calvin happened by chance to pass through Geneva and, having been kept there by Farel, set up his system in the teeth

of the bourgeois of Geneva, who were nicknamed *libertins* because they demanded freedom. Calvin had them expelled or put to death and introduced French or Italian refugees in their place, who turned Geneva into a colony of Calvinists.

Calvin abolished all traditional practices more thoroughly than Luther. He did away with the altar and its ornaments, had no clergy save *pastors* and *deacons*, and abolished the whole hierarchy, placing all pastors upon the same level. He meant worship to appeal to the spirit only, so it consisted in reading the Scriptures, sermons, prayers, and psalm-singing in the language of the country. Like Luther, he maintained the jurisdiction of the Church over believers, but handed it over to a *consistory*, only a third of which consisted of pastors, the other two thirds being made up of *elders* chosen from among prominent laymen, which supervised the conduct of the faithful and had power to summon them before it and pronounce sentence of censure, penance, or even exclusion, after which it denounced them to the secular authority, which imposed a material penalty. Being steeped in the ascetic ideal, Calvin condemned all pleasures and forbade all that made life pleasant — games, dancing, profane music, and personal adornment. He insisted upon a life with no amusements, entirely filled with work and religious exercises. He set up an Academy at Geneva for the training of pastors destined to preach the reformation in foreign lands.

After the middle of the sixteenth century, when the reform of the Church by the Council was seen to have definitely miscarried, the "*Reformed*" Church spread very rapidly, especially among the inhabitants of the towns and the nobles. It spread throughout the whole of Europe, with the exception of Spain, Italy, and the German and Scandinavian lands which had accepted Luther's reform, and was adopted in Scotland, France, the Netherlands, Poland, and Hungary and afterwards by some of the Dissenters in England. The organization created at Geneva was expanded so as to adapt it to more extensive territories. Every consistory sent delegates to an assembly representing a group of churches, which elected representatives to a general *synod* of the Church in that country.

In England, as in Germany, the character of the Church was determined by the personal will of the sovereign, and the country passed through four systems under four successive sovereigns: under Henry

VIII came the Schism, under Edward VI the Reformed Church, under Mary the Catholic Church, and the fourth was established by Elizabeth through a compromise which remained definitive. The Anglican Church retained the doctrine of the Reformed Church (with slight modifications): the liturgy in English, the suppression of monasteries, and the marriage of priests. From the old Church it retained the hierarchy of the secular clergy (bishops, deans, canons), episcopal jurisdiction, tithes, Church lands, the vestments of the officiating clergy, and forms which rendered worship more solemn.

All the Churches brought into existence by the revolt against the pope, and known collectively by the name of Protestant, had certain characteristics in common, for they claimed to be based upon the direct interpretation of revelation, contained in the Holy Scriptures, as opposed to tradition. They made few changes in the doctrine established by the Nicene Creed and retained all the dogmas specified in it: the Incarnation, the Trinity, eternal life, the Last Judgment, and original sin; remaining faithful to the dualist conception which holds that the nature of man tends spontaneously towards evil and the world is the domain of Satan. They rejected only the dogma of the "real presence" of the body of Christ in the Host, which is the foundation of the sacrifice of the Mass. But they revolutionized worship by having the liturgy in the vulgar tongue, by the position of capital importance given to the sermon, and by the abolition of five sacraments, though they retained infant baptism. They preserved the jurisdiction of the Church over the laity, but revolutionized the organization of the clergy by rejecting the authority of the pope and abolishing all regular clergy.

They also modified the relations of the Church with the secular authority. We must here consider the intentions of the reformers and the results of their actions, and note the difference between their churches in the sixteenth century and what they have become in the nineteenth. Luther and Calvin were not philosophers in search of a belief which should satisfy the reason; they were theologians, basing their doctrine upon their interpretation of Scripture, which seemed to them the only right one, and admitting of no other. They did not want to break up the unity of the universal Church. They claimed to reform it by bringing over all Christians to their Church, which they considered the only true one, the Church of the pope being in their eyes the

The Protestant churches

Church of Satan, those remaining in which would be damned. They had no more desire for “free examination” — the freedom of each man to choose his own religion — than the Middle Ages had had. They maintained the authority of the Church over the faith and conduct of believers, as exercised through a tribunal with the power of pronouncing condemnation. They maintained that it is the duty of the secular authority to compel its subjects to practise the true religion and forbid any other. The respect in which this authority differed from former practice was only in the nature of the penalties: the Roman Church still put heretics to death; the Reformed Churches rarely applied the death penalty. The Catholics condemned to death in England were condemned for actions regarded as political. As a matter of fact, the reformers broke up the unity of the Church and opened the way to liberty by basing their doctrine upon the interpretation of texts, which had varied with different persons.

The absolute opposition between the Churches, each of which declared itself the only legitimate one, necessarily caused every Christian endless agony of mind. He had to choose not between a better Church and a less perfect one, but between the Church of God, the only one that could save him, and that of the Devil, in which he was sure to be damned. The motive for the choice was an urgent one for either party. The new churches appealed to a man in his own language and offered him the joy of reading the Sacred Books and the hope of being placed in possession of the Word of God. They showed him the ministers of his religion leading a simple life, in contrast with the wealth of the Roman clergy, and delivered him from compulsory tithes and offerings. But the old Church had the advantage of preserving the form which he was in the habit of venerating: the Mass, relics, images, the cult of the Virgin, sacerdotal vestments, processions, and pilgrimages.

This separation into several Churches upset the relations between the different kinds of authority and reversed the part played by each. So long as there was only one Church, she imposed her authority upon all the laity, even upon sovereigns; but when several Churches were competing, it was the laity who chose between them. The choice was made not by the mass of the people, but by those in possession of authority: kings, princes, lords, and governing bodies of the towns. The religion of each country depended upon the personality of the laymen

in power, upon their convictions, politics, or fancy, upon those about them, and upon their family vicissitudes. The adherents of every creed felt a sense of solidarity between one country and another throughout the whole of Europe, and supported one another in war. Instead of being turned against the foreigner, hatred was concentrated upon a man's fellow-countrymen holding the opposite creed.

The principle, upheld by Luther and Calvin, that all authority is of God imposed upon the believer the duty of obeying it without resistance. Calvin said that the Christian ought to obey God rather than man, so that he may not obey an order contrary to the true faith, but his resistance should only be passive and he should endure martyrdom without rebelling. In point of fact the Lutheran churches were founded by the princes alone and maintained by their assistance. In Scotland, France, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and later even in England the Calvinists resisted actively and organized their churches in spite of the legitimate authority, or even in revolt against it.

The Catholic Reformation

The Lutheran churches were already established and the establishment of the Reformed churches was only beginning when those Christians who had remained faithful to the pope at last obtained the *Catholic Reformation* — that is, the restoration of order. As in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the way for it had been prepared by the foundation or reform of the religious orders in Italy and Spain: the Capuchins and the Oratorians, or priests of the Oratory. The most efficacious foundation had been the work of a soldier, Ignatius of Loyola, who combined a very just practical appreciation of the conditions of life with a mystical sense which went to the length of visions. He gave his foundation a military name, the *Compagnie de Jésus*, and compared the "spiritual exercises" which he imposed upon his companions to military exercises. He ordered them to stand aside from theological controversy and left very little place in their lives for the practice of asceticism, which would have distracted them from active work. To the three vows taken by all monks he added another, by which they placed themselves at the service of the pope.

Loyola had hesitated as to the use to which to put his Society and ultimately adopted the most efficacious procedure for bringing the

The work of the Council of Trent

faithful back to the obedience of the pope at a time when the privileged classes alone decided the religion of the whole people. He prompted the members of the Society to accept those functions which would give them the greatest power, such as those of confessor to princes or teachers of the ruling classes. The *Jesuits* (for such was the name given them by the public) founded boarding-schools, to which they attracted the sons of noble or rich families by giving them the education brought into fashion by the humanists — that is, the study of Latin authors. In contrast with the dirty garments and coarse manners of the monks, they wore priestly costume and adopted the polished manners of gentlemen. They prepared their pupils to obey the authority of the clergy by accustoming them to the frequent use of devotional practices and gained their attachment through gentleness, by introducing amusement into their schools and rarely resorting to the floggings which were a customary part of the education of the day. By these means the Society of Jesus obtained an influence which it used in the service of the pope for combating his adversaries, and it soon became the firmest support of the authority of the Holy See.

The restoration of the Church was ordered by the Council of Trent, which met in 1545 and, after two adjournments, ended in 1563. The first assembly, composed of bishops from Spain and Italy, uncompromising partisans of tradition, condemned all doctrinal change. The last one brought together the bishops of four nations — Italian, Spanish, French, and German (England and the Scandinavian lands not being represented). The measures adopted were officially voted in the assembly of all the bishops, but only as a matter of form, for no decision was arrived at till after a previous agreement between the Papal legates and the delegates of the three most powerful sovereigns, the Emperor and the kings of France and Spain. In order to satisfy their nations, the Emperor and France had requested that worship in the mother tongue and the marriage of priests should be allowed, but the legates succeeded in making no concessions.

The work of the Council of Trent

The Council arrived at two kinds of decisions: in matters of dogma it drew up *canons*, which took the form of an *anathema* upon the doctrine of the heretics; and in matters of organization it issued *decrees* regulating discipline among the clergy and the faithful.

As the basis of its doctrine the Council took the Holy Scriptures, not in the form of the Hebrew or Greek text, but in that of the *Vulgate*, a translation into Latin dating from the fourth century, to which it added the “unwritten traditions which, received from the mouth of Christ Himself by the Apostles or by the Apostles at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down to us, transmitted, so to speak, from hand to hand.” From this it drew the conclusion that all doctrines and practices established during the Middle Ages should be maintained, such as the exclusive use of Latin, the adoration of the Sacred Host, and the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, the reservation of the chalice for the priest only, the seven sacraments, confession and absolution, the indissolubility of marriage, the altar with its ornaments, the sacerdotal costume of priests, images, incense, and the sign of the cross. Without making them obligatory, it recommended the cult of the saints and of relics, pilgrimages, processions, and Mass for the repose of the souls of the dead (which implied a belief in purgatory).

In matters of discipline the Council maintained the whole hierarchy of the clergy with no lay participation in its control. The pope, proclaimed “Vicar of God and Universal Pastor,” was superior to the Council and retained supreme jurisdiction over appeals and all dispensing powers. He alone appointed the cardinals. Below the cardinals, the bishop had under his authority all the clergy in his diocese, even the monks, with the exception of those orders directly subject to the pope, and he still had the jurisdiction exercised by his *official*. The parish clergy — the parish priest and his curate — retained their power over the faithful on a lower plane. The Council commanded the priest to reside in his parish, preach on Sundays, and teach the children the catechism, and prescribed his costume and mode of life. In order to gain recruits for the priesthood, it was prescribed that every bishop was to found a seminary, in which youths destined for the priesthood might be educated. (These were only small seminaries as yet, and the Council’s order was only carried into effect slowly.) The faithful were commanded to observe fast-days and Lent and to abstain from work on the festivals of the Church.

The reform was completed by certain measures intended to establish uniformity of worship: the Roman catechism, the Roman *Breviary*, and the Roman *Missal*; and in order to prevent the spread of

heresy through reading, a commission was charged to draw up an *Index* of prohibited books.

The Church as restored by the Council differed from that of the Middle Ages in two respects: its doctrine was defined in a rigid form which allowed no further room for discussion. The Church was provided with institutions which enabled religious instruction and the habit of obedience to reach even the lowest grades of believers and of the lower clergy. The conduct of the clergy underwent a change. Hitherto they had looked on passively at the spread of the heretical Reformation; but now they entered actively into the struggle against it, under the direction of the Holy See and with the aid of the Society of Jesus. The war between the Churches led to persecutions and in several lands to civil wars, complicated by wars between the states.

POLITICAL LIFE FROM THE
FIFTEENTH CENTURY TO
THE MIDDLE OF THE
SEVENTEENTH

•

The Italian wars, 1494-1559

By the end of the fifteenth century three great monarchies had taken shape in the west of Europe, each covering a wide area: the ancient kingdoms of England and France and the new monarchy founded in Spain by the union of the two kingdoms of Castile and Aragon and the kingdoms annexed to them, and completed by the conquest of Granada, the last of the Moslem kingdoms. Next the Habsburgs, a family of German princes, united to their German territories in Austria first, by a marriage with the heiress of the house of Bugundy, the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, and later, by a marriage with the heiress to the throne of Spain, all the Spanish kingdoms. Charles, who succeeded to these three inheritances and was elected Emperor with the style of Charles V, possessed not only the highest dignity in Europe, but also the most extensive territories, which were soon enormously increased by the conquest of vast tracts in America. His brother Ferdinand, to whom he handed over the German domains of the Habsburgs, became King of Bohemia and Hungary by marriage.

Before the accumulation of this enormous domain by the house of Austria was complete, the kings of France had started upon their Italian wars. Charles VIII conquered the kingdom of Naples, and his successor, Louis XII, the duchy of Milan, but they failed to keep

The wars of religion

them. The King of Aragon formed regiments of foot-soldiers armed with pikes on the Swiss model and, in alliance with the small Italian states and the Pope, deprived the King of France of his conquests.

The war between the kings of France and Spain was complicated by a personal rivalry between the Emperor Charles V and Francis I, King of France, who attempted to regain his predecessor's conquests. Meanwhile, in eastern Europe the Sultan of the Ottoman Turks, who was already master of the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, subjugated almost the whole of Hungary. Having been defeated in Italy, Francis I entered into a secret alliance with the Moslem Sultan and afterwards with the heretical Lutheran princes of Germany. After several interruptions the war between the houses of Austria and France ended in 1559 in the victory of the King of Spain, Charles V's successor, who kept Naples and the territory of Milan. Italy, in partial subjection to a foreign king, was left disunited, impotent, and ruined, with the exception of Venice, which retained her fleet and her possessions on the Adriatic.

The wars of religion

A new series of wars, resulting from the struggle between the churches, started with the revolt of the Calvinist nobles against the Catholic sovereigns and was complicated by the intervention of foreign princes who supported those in revolt. The Reformation had been adopted only by the small Scandinavian kings and the princes of Germany. Only one powerful sovereign, Elizabeth, Queen of England, had been compelled to accept it, because her Catholic subjects refused to recognize her as the legitimate heir to the throne and would have none but Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, as Queen of England. All the other kings remained attached to the Roman Catholic Church.

The first revolt, that of the Scottish nobles against the Queen Regent, Queen Mary's mother, succeeded, thanks to a small English army, and had as its result the establishment of a Presbyterian Reformed Church in Scotland on the Genevan model. It gradually managed to consolidate its position, though remaining in conflict first with the Queen and afterwards with her son.

The revolt of the Calvinist princes of France was aimed not at King Charles IX, who was a minor, and his mother Catherine, the Queen Regent, but at the family of the princes of Guise, who were

Lorrainers and had obtained control of the Government despite the Queen Regent. Having gained custody of the King's person, they governed in his name, and the Catholic Church, reformed by the Council of Trent, remained officially that of the King, the kingdom, and the mass of the people. The Reformed (Calvinist) Church was that of a mere minority and was forced to hold itself on the defensive. It only escaped extermination by receiving help from the Queen of England, and afterwards from the Protestant princes of Germany. But at that time, when the regular troops consisted of professional soldiers — arquebusiers, Swiss regiments, and German light cavalry (*Reiter*, called in French *reîtres*) — no government had enough money to keep up an army for long. The royal Government could not succeed in getting together a large enough force to destroy the Reformed Churches, and all the wars which went on between 1563 and 1598 ended in a peace which took the form of an edict of the King's, granting his Calvinist subjects exceptional treatment.

In the Netherlands, where the King of Spain was sovereign prince of each of the seventeen provinces, opposition was first directed against those foreigners whom the King had sent to govern the land and against the ordinances enjoining that heretics were to be put to death. Though the local authorities were Catholics, they felt it too cruel that unoffending people should perish. The revolt did not begin till 1567 and took the form of spontaneous rioting against the images in the churches. The Duke of Alva was sent from Spain with a small army and remained master of the land for five years. He had a great many nobles and notables put to death and ended by imposing taxation that was contrary to custom. The war was begun at sea by corsairs known as the "*gueux de mer*" (sea beggars), under the flag of William, Prince of Orange. The insurrection spread to the province of Holland, where the Spanish army was forced to fall back when the inhabitants breached the dikes and flooded the country.

In England the resistance of the Catholics to the Queen became acute when in 1572 the Pope excommunicated her and released her subjects from their oath of fealty. The English Catholics started plotting, with the object of removing Elizabeth and replacing her by Mary Stuart, who was a prisoner in England. The Pope sent small expeditions to Ireland, where the Celtic-speaking natives had remained faithful to the Roman Church.

The unrest set up by religious persecution and wars was complicated by the dissensions among Catholics on political grounds, and in Germany by the conflict between the Lutheran and Calvinist princes. In France a party was started by the Catholic Governor of Languedoc which allied itself with the Calvinist party under the name of "associated Catholics." This coalition compelled the King to issue an edict so favourable to those of the Reformed faith that zealous Catholics formed a "Holy League" to resist it, which ultimately refused to obey the King.

In the Netherlands there was a revolt of the Spanish army, which was no longer receiving its pay. In 1576 the local authorities formed a Confederation of all the provinces, which fought against the mutinous army in the name of the King. But their agreement broke down over religion; a League was formed among the Catholics in the south, while in the north a "Perpetual Union" of Protestants proclaimed the deposition of King Philip from his position as Count of Holland and Zeeland. The reorganized Spanish army, however, obtained the submission of all the southern provinces, and the Union of the North was consolidated and developed into the Republic of the United Provinces, in which the Reformed faith was the State religion. This was the origin of the separation between Belgium and the Netherlands.

Philip, King of Spain, and now King of Portugal as well, entered into an alliance with the princes of the house of Guise, the heads of the League, for exterminating the Calvinists in France. Operations were devised for recovering the United Provinces and landing an army in England to depose Elizabeth, but failed owing to the destruction of the Spanish fleet, the "Invincible Armada."

All the Protestants menaced by the King of Spain formed a coalition against him: the Queen of England, the King of Navarre, who had become Henry IV, King of France, the United Provinces, and the German princes. Having exhausted his resources, Philip was powerless to prevent English sailors from attacking the Spanish ports, or Henry IV from being recognized as king by the whole of France, or the Dutch army from freeing the whole territory of the United Provinces and even conquering a strip of the southern provinces. The war was interrupted by a period of peace between Spain and the other states.

At the same time religious strife in Germany developed into civil war. The Catholic princes of Bavaria and Austria, whose subjects had

turned Lutheran, expelled the pastors and compelled the bourgeois to declare themselves Catholics. The Emperor Rudolf quarrelled with his brother, the Archduke Matthias, and alarmed the Protestant lords in all his domains — Austria, Hungary, Moravia, and Bohemia — by his attempts to restore the Catholic Church by force. They revolted, handed over the power to Matthias, and entered into leagues of mutual defence. Henry IV was still in alliance with the Protestant princes and was preparing for war in Germany when he was assassinated.

Political wars

War was resumed as the result of a revolt in Bohemia; this was the last of the wars of religion and soon developed into a political war. Ferdinand, the new head of the house of Austria, who was devoted to the Catholic religion, was elected Emperor and proclaimed King of Bohemia. Feeling themselves threatened by a Catholic restoration, his subjects of Czech nationality, mostly Protestants, revolted and offered the crown of Bohemia to a prince from western Germany, the Elector Palatine of the Rhine, the head of the *Union* formed by the German Protestant princes. Thus began the “Thirty Years’ War.” The armies of the Emperor and the League of Catholic princes crushed the rebel army and occupied Bohemia, where they re-established compulsory obedience to the Catholic Church and the absolute power of the King. The Czech nobles were executed or expelled and their places taken by foreigners, Germans or Italians, who were ready to obey the court of Vienna. The Czech people, brought back by force to the Catholic religion and deprived of its leaders, remained subject to a foreign nobility, and the Czech language ceased to be spoken except by the lower classes. All the German provinces of the house of Austria were brought into submission to the Catholic Church and the absolute power of the Prince in the same way. The King of Spain, as the Emperor’s ally, took part in the war with the Elector Palatine and afterwards with the United Provinces.

For purposes of war the governments would enlist adventurers of all nations, but with the exception of Holland none of them had money enough to pay their men or establish magazines of supplies. The leader of a band in the service of the Union of Protestant princes set the example of how to support an unpaid army by allowing it to live upon the country at the expense of the inhabitants. This procedure

was adopted on a larger scale by Wallenstein, who succeeding in collecting a strong army to serve the Emperor. Without seeking battle, he marched it through Germany so as to alarm the princes and towns and force them to recognize the Emperor's authority and make Germany an absolute monarchy. He seemed to be succeeding in this when the Emperor, without consulting the Diet, confiscated a duchy belonging to a prince, gave it to Wallenstein, and resumed possession of the Church lands secularized by the princes since 1555.

His operations were checked by two foreign kings who intervened in Germany for purely political reasons. The King of Sweden entered the war to prevent the Emperor's fleet and army from seizing the shores of the Baltic. He brought with him an army composed of his Swedish subjects, called up in virtue of their duty of service to the King in war, the cavalry being composed of the wealthier landowners, and the infantry recruited from among the poorest peasants. He crossed the whole of Germany from the north-east to the south-west and defeated the armies of the Emperor and the League. But he was slain, and the Imperial army destroyed the Swedish armies and those of the German Protestant princes.

It was now that the King of France intervened directly to prevent the house of Austria from extending its sway over the other states. This was the personal achievement of Cardinal Richelieu. Though a prince of the Church, he dared to enter into an alliance with heretical princes against the two Catholic sovereigns, despite the King's family, the court, and the people, who wanted peace. The war dragged on for a long time without decisive results, and only ended when the armies of the two allies — that of France coming from the west by way of the Danube and that of Sweden coming from the north through Germany and Bohemia — threatened Vienna simultaneously.

Peace was concluded in Germany by the Congress of Westphalia, attended by delegates from most of the European states. Its direct result was to prevent the Emperor from exercising any real authority over the German princes and to leave Germany split up into a large number of territories, which became in practice independent states with the power of making war and concluding alliances. The two foreign kings gained some territory by it, the King of Sweden on the shores of the Baltic and the King of France some vaguely defined rights in Alsace. Spain continued the war against France.

The first series of wars had ruined Italy, the second Spain and Belgium, and the third Germany. The most prosperous states were now England, which had taken no part in the wars, and the United Provinces, which had inherited the trade of Belgium.

The Civil War in Great Britain

Before the end of the second war a revolution had broken out in England (it would be more correct to say in Great Britain). The accession of James Stuart, King of Scotland, to the throne of England had united the two kingdoms under the same sovereign, while maintaining two separate governments and, above all, two different State Churches, the Anglican and the Presbyterian. The authority of the King in England, which had been almost unlimited during the sixteenth century, was called in question by Parliament because James was personally irresolute and little respected; yet he was able to rule without summoning Parliament during almost the whole of his reign. His son Charles, after a few attempts to come to an understanding with the House of Commons, ceased summoning Parliament for ten years and governed as an absolute sovereign. His English subjects, discontented with this state of affairs, had no practicable means of putting an end to it, for the King had the armed forces and the judges at his disposal and sufficient revenues for times of peace.

What put an end to absolute government was not, as was afterwards believed, the refusal of the English to pay a tax, but a religious revolt, which began in Scotland when the King tried to impose the liturgy of the Church of England upon his Scottish subjects. To find financial resources for fighting against the Scottish rebels, he summoned the English Parliament, which compelled him to renounce absolute power by abolishing the courts with an exceptional procedure. It was when the Irish Catholics revolted that Parliament, fearing to leave an army at the King's disposal, decided to enrol an army with commanders appointed by itself. The conflict developed into a civil war between the King's party and the Anglican Church, on the one hand, and the party of Parliament, the Scots, and the Presbyterians on the other. It dragged on owing to the weakness of the armies, formed mainly of mounted men, and ended with the defeat of the King and the Anglican Church. England remained in the power of a Parliament the majority of which had accepted the system of the Scottish Church.

Changes in political systems

The political system of the European states continued to change, but followed different tendencies in the three great regions of Europe.

In the three western monarchies the central power of the king was growing strong enough for him to impose his will upon all others: the great lords owning vast domains, the prelates, and the governing bodies of the towns. He could not abolish them, for they were consecrated by a respected tradition. In Spain the absolute power of the crown was first established in the kingdoms of Castile, where the assembly of the Cortes had become a mere formality, and afterwards in the kingdom of Aragon. The authority of the king became absolute in the kingdom of Portugal after it had regained its independence under a new dynasty.

In England the "Wars of the Roses," a civil war between the two rival branches of the royal family (1460 to 1485) had destroyed almost all the great noble families, and the king had taken advantage of this to seize their domains and create a new and much more docile nobility. He had next profited by the suppression of the monasteries to confiscate their property. He had succeeded in governing as master of the land and controlling the religion of England at will without suppressing Parliament, but had rarely summoned it and left it nothing to do but ratify the royal decisions. The Stuart kings were able, when they chose, to govern without it.

During the sixteenth century the king of France completed the process of uniting the territories of all the princes in the realm with his own domain. No feudal powers then remained. Those known as "the great ones (*les grands*)" were merely the members of the king's family, known as the "princes of the blood," or great dignitaries who had risen through the king's favour. The king exercised his absolute power every time he gave an order. The "great ones" only resisted when there was a king too young or weak to command, but the royal authority was always restored so soon as a king wished it.

The sovereigns' mode of life was changing and with it the procedure of government. The kings were ceasing to be military leaders and to lead their armies in person. They no longer travelled about their dominions and were growing accustomed to living in a permanent residence. The change had taken place by a natural process in

England, where the king had never had to show himself in order to be obeyed and seldom had occasion to go to war. The supreme power might even be exerted by a woman, Queen Elizabeth.

In Spain the change was even more complete. Philip II had a residence built for him, the Escorial, which was at once a castle and a monastery, and governed from his study by having written reports submitted to him, on which he noted his decisions. His successors went still farther and ceased to govern, their place being taken by a favourite (*privado*), who exercised the full royal power. This deputy was only an ordinary gentleman, raised to the rank of a great lord by the king's favour. In France Richelieu, and afterwards Mazarin, exercised the full royal authority with the title of "premier" or "principal minister." In England the favourites of James I and Charles I tried to govern in place of the King.

This new usage marked a profound change in the conception of authority. It was now ceasing to be regarded as a personal order given by a military leader and becoming an attribute of functions belonging to the head of the State. It was an abstract power that might be detached from his person and delegated to the man whom he was pleased to choose. Hence subjects owed the king's delegate the same obedience as they did to the king himself. France stood out longest against this change. The last king who made war was a French king, Louis XIII, and up to the middle of the seventeenth century the king's delegates, Richelieu and Mazarin, met with resistance from the great nobles, who declared that they were only bound to obey the king in person.

Central Europe, where there was no longer any supreme authority, continued to be split up among a very large number of local authorities, whether territorial princes or the governing bodies of towns. In Germany there remained a semblance of common government, organized at the end of the fifteenth century in the shape of the *Diet*, or assembly of the princes and cities, but the emperor was no longer obeyed. In Italy, as in Germany, effective public authority was vested only in the masters of a territory. There were a few small republics, governed by hereditary privileged bodies composed of nobles or bourgeois. In all territories authority was unlimited and tended to become absolute.

Two republics had split off from the Empire and organized them-

selves as permanent confederations. The Confederation of the thirteen cantons, composed of a heterogeneous collection of small sovereign republics with their allies and subjects, had become powerful at the end of the fifteenth century because it provided the regiments of Swiss infantry that were hired by foreign kings, but during the sixteenth century it was paralysed by the struggle between the cantons professing either of the two religions. The Confederation of the United Provinces was made up of seven sovereign provinces, each governed on a different system. Holland, the most powerful of them, was itself a federation of eighteen autonomous towns governed by the principal bourgeois families. Every province had its governor, with the ancient title of *Stadhouder* (king's lieutenant), but he was a prince of the house of Orange-Nassau, the same one ruling over five and sometimes six provinces. The Confederation had a general assembly of delegates from all the provinces and a "captain general" as head of the army.

The Scandinavian states which had been united under the king of Denmark in the fifteenth century had separated. In 1521, as the result of a national revolt, Sweden had become an independent state under a new native dynasty which had confiscated the domains of the clergy and founded a Lutheran Church. In the seventeenth century a Lutheran revolt against a king who had become a Catholic transformed it into an aristocratic monarchy in which power was divided between the king, a *senate* composed of the great dignitaries, and an assembly of the four estates, dominated by the nobility.

In eastern Europe the royal authority had become weaker in the three kingdoms of Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, where the kings of foreign origin had been compelled to recognize the powers of the nobility. It remained hereditary in Bohemia and became absolute again after the repression of the revolt. Hungary was almost entirely subject to the sultan, who allowed the lords to govern the people on their domains and choose their religion. The king only continued to hold a narrow strip bordering upon Austria and two dependencies with a Slav population: in the north the Slovaks and in the south Croatia, where he was so weak that he left the administration in the hands of dignitaries appointed for life. The assembly of nobles voted the taxes, which fell upon the peasants, and the levy in case of war. The king was even weaker in Poland, where in the sixteenth century he had

The machinery of government

to recognize the elective character of the monarchy. He could not raise either taxes or troops without the unanimous consent of all the members of the assembly, formed of deputies of the nobles.

Russia at that time was cut off from Europe by the difference of religion and was passing through a series of crises. The Grand Prince of Moscow, Ivan, known as the Terrible, had assumed the Imperial title of *Tsar* as early as 1547. Since no other Russian princes remained, his power had become unlimited. He entered into a struggle against the *boyars*, or great landowners, and organized his partisans into a bodyguard which he used for arresting and massacring his other subjects. But when the princely family of Rurik became extinct, power was disputed between a number of pretenders, and the neighbouring peoples, the Swedes and Poles, took advantage of this to intervene with their armies. The domination of these foreigners, regarded as heretics, provoked an outburst of Russian and Orthodox sentiment. An assembly of notables, presided over by the Patriarch of Moscow, chose as tsar a relative of the Patriarch's, who founded the new Imperial family of the Romanovs. In the seventeenth century power was exercised simultaneously by the tsar, as head of the State, and the patriarch, as head of the Church. The tsar continued to possess absolute power and his ordinances (*ukaz*) were law.

The machinery of government

The official auxiliary of the sovereign in the government of the State was still his council, chosen by himself on no fixed rule, though he was obliged by custom to include in it the members of the royal family and those occupying high offices. This was the practice in the English *Privy Council* and the French *Conseil du Roi* and was followed by the princes of Germany and Italy. But in the great monarchies it tended to become a mere matter of form for the king to summon this official council of which he was no longer entirely the master, and he preferred to consult confidential advisers. These were men of comparatively humble position employed in the confidential clerical work connected with the Government, who, thanks to their functions, were always well informed about affairs. They adopted the title of *secretary of State*, first in Spain and afterwards in France and England, a term which is still the title of certain ministers. In the less highly developed kingdoms (Sweden, Poland, Hungary) the council

The machinery of government

still consisted exclusively of those occupying high offices, and shared the power with the king. Even in Russia a council was formed during the seventeenth century consisting of the great lords and known as the *Duma* of the boyars.

Authority was still exercised over the king's subjects chiefly through the judicial system, which still combined police functions with its juridical ones. In almost all states the regular courts of justice exercising the civil and criminal jurisdiction were composed of professional judges, who were bound to have studied law to some extent. England retained its custom of having notables as judges, who served without pay and had not studied law. These were the *justices of the peace*, of whom there were 1,738 in the year 1580 for all the counties of England, and whose duty it was to take all measures to "keep the peace" — that is, to maintain order. Their procedure was summary, and they could even pronounce sentence of death upon those of low degree, such as vagabonds or thieves. The trial of persons of respectable position was in the hands of the *assize* courts, presided over by a royal judge on circuit, with the assistance of a *jury* of twelve men in easy circumstances, whose duty it was to return a verdict on the facts, after which the judge pronounced sentence according to the law. In Poland and Hungary alone the judges were elected by an assembly of all the nobles of the district.

The judicial system was also made use of by governments for ridding themselves of their political opponents by having them tried by a special tribunal standing outside the regular machinery of the law, so as to facilitate a condemnation. In England this was formed by the *Privy Council*, sitting in the "Star Chamber," which was abolished at the beginning of the Revolution. In France there were special commissions formed of members chosen for the purpose by the Government.

In order to secure the execution of their orders throughout the whole extent of their dominions and to obtain information about the acts of their subjects, the mediæval governments had maintained agents with permanent posts to whom full powers were delegated and who were known by the Latin name of *bailli* (*bajulivus*, custodian or guardian). This primitive method was preserved in Spain, under the name of *corregidor* (corrector), the Scandinavian kingdoms, and the territories of the German princes. The prince's agent was assisted

The machinery of government

by lawyers or local persons. The governments gradually began to distinguish between the various kinds of functions and place them in the hands of different agents. They created military governors who were in charge of the troops, special judges for crimes committed by soldiers and brigands, agents known by the vague name of "commissaries" or "intendants" to provide for the needs of the armies, and special officials for finance.

It was in France that this specialization was pushed to its greatest length, on a system which remained unique in Europe. The king instituted *offices* for the various functions and began to put them up for public sale, afterwards creating offices for raising money by their sale. The purchaser gradually acquired the right to occupy the office for life and the custom grew up of allowing him to sell it or dispose of it by will. The purchasers were bourgeois belonging to the region in which they had to exercise their functions. When the Government found itself no longer able to count upon these titular "officers" to execute its orders properly or keep it informed about the conduct of local people, it was led to employ agents with nothing but a *commission* revocable at will and known as "intendants for justice, police, and finance."

To meet the constantly increasing expenditure of the State the governments strengthened the system of taxation, the taxes now becoming permanent, though in most states direct taxation still required the consent of an assembly as a matter of form. By the sixteenth century the taxes had become inadequate, and governments had recourse to very varying expedients. In England monopolies were granted for the manufacture or sale of certain articles, in France there was a wholesale disposal of offices. But, above all, the governments raised loans, granting the lenders as security the right to collect certain of the revenues of State. In France the king created permanent annuities (*rentes*), which were the origin of the French public debt, and the emperor and the king of Spain borrowed from the German or Genoese bankers and, in the end, never repaid them.

After the Reformation all states had to draw up regulations for the organization of the Church in their territories. The Catholic kings and princes concluded *concordats* with the pope, who left them *de facto* the power of choosing the prelates while reserving to himself the right to invest them with their office and levy certain taxes upon the

clergy. The Protestant princes regulated worship and discipline.

In those states where only one form of worship was tolerated — that is, the Catholic countries and the Lutheran kingdoms of Scandinavia — all subjects were compelled to practise the same form of worship as their sovereign. But those states in which the Government accepted or tolerated a different form of worship soon had to set up a new system. In England, Scotland, the United Provinces, and the Protestant territories of Germany the public worship of the State Church was alone allowed, but the Catholic religion continued to be practised in secret, often with the connivance of the authorities, though at times accompanied by repressive measures against Catholic priests and believers. After 1572 the public practice of several forms of worship was officially admitted in Poland for three creeds (the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed). In Hungary the Magyar lords founded Calvinist churches, and the German colonists Lutheran ones. France established exceptional treatment for those belonging to the Reformed Church. The King granted “liberty of conscience” to members of the Reformed Church, which secured them against prosecution for heresy, and a measure of freedom of worship in proportion to their rank in society.

The army

The relations between states were organized as a result of certain innovations: the regular army in war and diplomacy in peace. The changes in the army were due rather to novelties in its organization than to technical progress in firearms, for battles were still decided mainly by side-arms. The old cavalry consisting of “*gendarmes*,” charging in a body with the lance, survived up to the middle of the seventeenth century. But during the sixteenth century a light cavalry had come into being in Germany, known as *Reiters*, armed with the sword and pistol, and later the *carabineers*, with a longer type of firearm.

Progress was slow in the infantry. Up to the end of the sixteenth century it was still organized on the Swiss model, imitated by the German *Landsknechte*. It was drawn up in a very deep mass and armed with long pikes. Since it could only operate on the field of battle, it was supplemented first by *arquebusiers*, armed with the *arquebus* lighted by a fuse, who operated on the flanks and were also used for

sieges, and then by *musketeers*, armed with the musket, the match of which had to be kept alight, and fighting among the pikemen.

The decisive advance was made in Holland by the Stadhouders of Holland and Frisia, who had studied the art of war in the works of antiquity. The infantry, armed with the pike or musket and the sword, was divided into smaller units, known as *companies*, consisting of a hundred men with several officers (the captain, lieutenant, and ensign) and non-commissioned officers, so that orders could be transmitted rapidly. These soldiers were stationed as garrisons in the towns, or else kept in camp, and went through a methodical training with regular drill which enabled them to march in good order and carry out combined manœuvres. Following the Roman example, they were accustomed to constructing earthworks, which the soldiers of those days refused to do, as being unworthy of their profession. They also became skilled in laying siege to fortresses, which was still the principal operation carried out by the Dutch armies. The Government supplied them with arms, equipment, and victuals, so that they no longer required to live on the country and did not disband for purposes of looting. The Dutch Government, the only one at that period which paid its troops regularly, was able to expect regular service of its soldiers. The King of Sweden made the infantry more mobile by decreasing the weight which they had to carry and giving them fur garments for winter campaigning. The degeneration in the art of war that had gone on during the later years of the Thirty Years' War and the Civil War in England was marked by the fact that the proportion of infantry diminished, because mounted men had more facilities for pillaging, and volunteers preferred to enlist in the cavalry. In time of peace the sovereigns — even the kings of France and Spain — kept only a very small number of infantry, consisting of pikemen and musketeers organized in regiments. The tsar had created an infantry force known as *Stryeltsy* (sharpshooters).

Diplomacy

In the fifteenth century the republics of Italy — first Venice and Florence — had formed a body of men entrusted with their relations with foreign governments, which served as a model to others. These were imitated by the most powerful sovereigns in the sixteenth century, the emperor and the king of England, and later by the king of

France. Each of them sent a representative to the courts of the others, a lord or prelate known by the Italian name of *ambassador*, whose duty it was to maintain official relations with it. The number of these increased during the seventeenth century, and the sovereigns had ambassadors permanently resident in most foreign states. This position was given to important persons and very badly remunerated.

It was on Italian models that the practices known as *diplomacy* became established in the sixteenth century for regulating intercourse between states: the *instructions* given by a government to the ambassador as to the conduct he was to adopt, the *dispatches* and *reports* sent by the ambassador to his Government, and the *cipher* for preserving the secrecy of correspondence.

It was in Italy that the theory which summed up the actual practice of diplomatists was formulated. It was stated at the beginning of the sixteenth century by a Florentine, Machiavelli, in his book entitled *The Prince*, and is still known as "Machiavellianism." The theory admitted in the Middle Ages, which was based upon the community between all Christians, assumed that the prince must follow the rules of Christian morality in dealing with other princes. On examining the practice of his age Machiavelli came to the conclusion that in dealing with other men princes followed no rule save that of the interest of their own state and sought only to acquire wealth, territories, or glory at the expense of others. He concluded from this that all means — war, cruelty, or roguery — were legitimate if they led to success. Machiavellianism, founded upon the absolute right of the sovereign, was the form assumed by absolutism in external politics.

SOCIETY FROM THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY TO THE MIDDLE OF THE SEVENTEENTH



The population

We have no information about the numbers of the population. It does not seem to have increased much, except, perhaps, in the almost unpeopled lands of eastern Europe. It had decreased in Spain by the end of the sixteenth century and in Germany during the war in the seventeenth. The proportion of the urban population had altered, some lands having suffered from war while in others wealth had increased; chief among these was Holland, where the proportion of urban residents in the seventeenth century is acknowledged to have reached the figure, unique at that time, of two thirds of the whole population. The population of London was multiplied at least by three. Paris was still the largest city in Europe.

Effects of discoveries

The life of Europe was affected by an event of material importance, the discovery of America and the Far East. The navigators who made these discoveries were merely in search of a less costly route by which to go and fetch the products of distant lands — precious stones, silks, and pepper and, above all, spices (cinnamon, cloves, nutmeg, and ginger). It was necessary to go and get them from the Arabs in Egypt, who charged very high prices. The Portuguese, coasting along

Agricultural and industrial production

the shores of Africa, had taken the sensible route to India by trying to sail round the south of the continent. Columbus, a native of Genoa, proposed to the King of Portugal to go to India by the westward route. His plan, which was based upon a colossal error as to the size of the globe, was rightly rejected. It was accepted by the Queen of Castile, which was not at that time a maritime power. Working in the service of Castile, Columbus discovered the West Indies (Antilles), and afterwards a part of South America, which to the end of his life he supposed to be India; hence the name *Indians* applied to the natives and that of "West Indies" applied to America. Thanks to this accident it was the Castilians, a people strange to the sea, who explored, conquered, and colonized the greater part of America, the language of which is still Castilian Spanish. The natural route to the Indies round South Africa was followed as early as 1498 by the expedition of Vasco da Gama, in the service of the King of Portugal, and only eight years after Columbus's discovery a Portuguese expedition, driven out of its course by a storm, landed in South America and took possession of Brazil, which remained a Portuguese possession and still speaks Portuguese.

These discoveries had as their direct result to reveal to Europeans parts of the earth far more extensive and populous than Europe, and stir their imagination by upsetting their ideas on the size of the globe. They altered the great overseas routes, which shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and the great commercial centres, which were transferred from Italy to Portugal and later to the Netherlands. They greatly increased the quantities of gold and silver in the possession of Europeans. It was not till later that they introduced into Europe new plants for cultivation.

Agricultural and industrial production

The means of production increased at once through progress in technical processes and through the opening up of lands outside Europe which provided new resources.

Agriculture could make but slow progress in lands where it was paralysed by the rules of the triennial rotation of crops. This is why, as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century, many great English landowners obtained permission from the Government to enclose their lands and use them as pasturage for sheep, wool being at that time

the most salable commodity. This process called forth violent protests in England, but appears to have been applied hardly anywhere except in the central counties. The countries free from restrictions, Italy and Belgium, where the production of industrial crops had been started, were impoverished by war. It was in Holland that the decisive advance was taken which gave birth to modern agriculture. The Dutch, who had learned how to dry the flooded areas bordering on the sea, invented the art of drying up marshes and draining waterlogged lands. They changed the rotation of crops by introducing forage crops, which made it possible to do away with the system of fallows (see Chapter XV). They set the example of systematic cultivation of fruit-trees and even flowers.

New plants were beginning to be introduced into Europe from America. The potato was known by the end of the sixteenth century, but came into use only slowly. Maize, known in America as "Indian corn" and in some parts of Europe as "Turkish corn," was cultivated in the south-eastern lands where the summers were hot.

Industry was making more rapid progress, which was a source of profit to many lands. The sixteenth century was a time when men's imaginations were ardently at work discovering the secrets of nature by an indiscriminate use of rational methods of research and the occult sciences — astrology, magic, and alchemy — the period of charlatans and of attempts to make gold, but it also produced some practical inventions, due chiefly to the use of water-power and applied heat. The mill-wheel, driven by a stream of water, was used in metal-work for sawing, crushing, piercing, beating, and hammering the metal and for wire-drawing. The invention of the *blast-furnace*, generating a very high temperature, provided a steadier method of smelting iron ore. The cast iron thus obtained provided material of a more uniform consistency, which was used both by smiths for the manufacture of nails, horseshoes, and implements and by gun-casters for making much larger cannon.

At the very time when the silver mines in Germany and Hungary were becoming exhausted, the amalgamation of mercury with silver made it possible to treat by a cheaper and more expeditious process the ore from the mines discovered in Peru and Mexico in the middle of the sixteenth century. Other inventions led to progress in the production of textiles, woollen, linen, and silk. These were the spinning-

wheel with a pedal, machines for knitting, stocking-knitting, and ribbon-weaving, and the dark blue dye known as *indigo* (coming from India).

Navigation was stimulated by progress in shipbuilding affecting the position of the masts and rigging and by the new charts on Mercator's projection. It now had larger and stronger ships at its disposal and more trustworthy means of direction-finding, which made it possible to take long voyages and build up ocean-going trade.

Various inventions took place during the sixteenth century and were brought to perfection during the seventeenth: the watch with springs, and chocolate, which was invented in Spain from the cocoa brought from America. After the end of the sixteenth century inventions were chiefly in the luxury industries: tapestry for decorating walls, lace, which was invented simultaneously in Flanders and in Venice, silk stuffs shot with gold and silver, the velvets of Venice and Milan, the looking-glasses and glass mirrors which remained the secret of Venice, spectacles invented in Holland, pendulum-clocks, hanging lamps on the model devised by Cardano, and the light coach, which had become the outward sign of wealth.

Commerce

Trade had been revolutionized by the discovery of the route to the Indies and the settlement of Europeans in America; it dealt with new commodities and followed new routes across the oceans. The busiest fleets were now those of the peoples on the Atlantic, first the Portuguese and Belgians and afterwards the English and Dutch. In the sixteenth century the commercial centres, especially for spices, were Lisbon and Antwerp, but from the end of the century onwards London and Amsterdam. The inrush of silver from the American mines caused an abrupt increase in the quantity of money in circulation and a crisis in prices. From the middle of the sixteenth century onwards there was an unprecedented rise in prices, first in Spain, then in France, and later, though to a smaller extent, in England.

Overland trade was facilitated by the *posting* system instituted before the end of the sixteenth century. The governments established posting-houses along the main roads, kept by "postmasters" whose duty it was to provide horses for travellers and distribute letters. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the posts were sufficiently

organized to provide a weekly or monthly service between all the great cities in Europe. In the seventeenth century printing began to be used for commercial purposes. Periodical publications providing political and commercial news were founded by private persons. They first appeared in Germany at the time of the great fairs under the name of *Zeitung*, and later in Italy under the name of *Gazzetta*, which was afterwards adopted in Holland and France.

The devices invented in Italy as early as the Middle Ages spread to other lands and were perfected in the maritime cities, first in Antwerp and afterwards in London and Amsterdam. Italian book-keeping, using the Arabic numerals and double entry, was adopted in other lands during the sixteenth century. Bankers accepted deposits of money from their clients and effected transfers by means of letters of credit or bills of exchange, but the client still had to come and draw his money in person. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the process of *endorsement* came into use, by which a client could sign his name at the foot of the letter and hand it to some other person, thus drawing his money without personal inconvenience.

Banking transactions were beginning to be carried out through a public bank. This procedure, invented in Genoa and imitated in Venice, was perfected by the bank founded at Amsterdam in 1609. It was a deposit bank, issuing no notes, and had to keep a reserve of metallic currency sufficient to cover its deposits. It dealt in metals and currency, which it turned into good money, so as to maintain a stable unity of currency. This proved such a convenience that merchants began paying in their money and opening accounts with it. It was imitated in Hamburg and later in Sweden.

Fairs were still held at Lyons, Geneva, Leipzig, and Frankfurt, but their place was beginning to be taken by a sort of permanent fair. A building open to merchants from all countries served as a meeting-place where purchases could be effected, after which the parties to the bargain went and saw the goods deposited in warehouses. The first of these had been established at Antwerp, under the name of *Bourse*, which was adopted by other establishments of the same sort and imitated in Amsterdam and London, where it was called the *Royal Exchange*. In dealing with foreigners merchants employed agents known as brokers (French *courtiers*, German *Makler*), who were organized into an official body as early as the sixteenth century. Mari-

time insurance, an Italian invention, was frequently resorted to, and was controlled in England by a commission and in Holland by a chamber of insurance.

The association of merchants, originally organized on the same lines as the craft guilds, required certain personal duties of its members, whom it recruited among the apprentices belonging to the same families. It prevented them from competing among themselves and compelled them to conform to the ethical standard of their profession.

Associations with a narrower scope began to grow up during the sixteenth century. The "commercial house," owned in common by a number of persons, usually of the same family, had been merely a business with several heads. It now began to develop into an abstract entity owning a common property distinct from the fortune of each of the partners. This was known in Italian by the abstract term *ragione* (French *raison sociale*, German *Firma*, English *firm*), implying the novel idea of an impersonal capital employed in the business. This system of sharing, created by private initiative without the intervention of the authorities, became widespread in England under the name of *partnership*.

Transactions in the Indies required enough capital for traders to be able to await the right moment for realizing a profit on the sale of the goods, and, what was more serious, a capital sunk in the establishment of fortified settlements. In Spain and Portugal these transactions were carried out at the expense of the king, who had the goods sold for his own profit and claimed a monopoly. When carried out by incompetent and dishonest officials, this system was not at all a success. After the middle of the sixteenth century commercial companies of a novel type were founded in England by merchants in association with noblemen about the court and under the protection of the Government. The company received a royal *charter* by which it became a "regulated company," recognized as a permanent legal corporation and having the sole right to trade within a certain area. It managed transactions of common interest, fixing the quantity and price of goods and the sailings of ships, and taking measures for their defence. The company was open to any English merchant on payment of a sum for entrance, each of them carrying on his commercial enterprises on his own account.

In Holland, where private companies for sea-borne trade were

Economic action on the part of governments

already in existence, there were a number of competing companies. The Government induced them to combine and form an "East India Company," to which the Government granted a monopoly of Indian trade. It was divided into Chambers governed by *directors*, who had subscribed most of the capital and settled the amount of the dividends. The same system was applied to the West Indian Company. The capital subscribed by each member continued to be his own property, and he had a right to its repayment at the end of ten years. As a matter of fact the shares were sold by auction and were the first security in which speculation took place on the Amsterdam Bourse. Capital, now regarded as independent of the persons subscribing it, remained permanently attached to the business enterprise. A few English companies retained the custom of calling the shareholders "brother" or "sister," thus recalling the ancient guild spirit, but by the seventeenth century this form of partnership had arrived, by a series of transitions, at a system which was the opposite of the mediæval guild. Instead of a local and personal association, bound by moral laws, without any capital, and working for profits fixed by custom, the commercial company was becoming a national, impersonal enterprise with a permanent common capital, working for unlimited profits and having no moral restrictions.

Maritime trade was sometimes carried on by methods indistinguishable from a military enterprise. Many shipbuilders, authorized by their sovereign, used their ships for privateering—that is, capturing the merchant ships of states with which they were at war. Others went and bought slaves from the Negro chiefs on the African coast and sold them to the plantations in the tropical regions of America. Privateering and the slave-trade sprang up in response to the desire for quick and unlimited profits.

Unlike industry, the changes in which were due to inventions calculated to improve the processes of work, trade was progressing by means of processes which led to unexpected innovations.

Economic action on the part of governments

The public authorities acted upon economic life in various ways. By imposing a single form of worship upon all their subjects, governments were compelling those who failed to conform to it to emigrate, and almost all of these were townspeople, craftsmen and merchants

belonging to the Reformed faith. Leaving France and Belgium, they took refuge in the Protestant lands, England and Holland, taking with them their industrial experience, commercial relations, and capital. The trade and industry of Antwerp were transferred to Amsterdam, those of Cologne to Frankfurt, the cloth industry moved to Norwich, the trade in colonial produce to Hamburg. These religious refugees carried with them habits of work and thrift and a spirit of enterprise which helped to found the prosperity of Holland and England.

The governments of the great states adopted an economic policy copied from that of the Italian commercial cities, but adapted to a larger territory. It was based upon the idea generally held in the Middle Ages that the authorities had unlimited power of regulating every detail of economic life, the processes of labour, commercial transactions, currency, prices, and wages. The governments tried to use their authority to obtain the greatest amount of power for the State. Hence they aimed at increasing their wealth in the most visible and mobile form: that of money, which gave them the means of providing for their needs, and especially for the expenditure on the army and court. To increase their supply of money or preserve the largest possible amount, they applied the same measures as the towns had done for preventing money from leaving the country or bringing it in. They forbade the export of gold and silver (though without any great success) or the import of foreign produce which would have been paid for in money, or of raw materials, especially wool and wood for naval construction. They forbade craftsmen in the luxury industries to go abroad, where they might compete with the home country, or to import foreign produce that would have to be paid for in money.

They also took measures to increase the manufacture of the industrial products consumed by the inhabitants of the country, and at the same time to find employment for their subjects; to build ships in order to secure for their country the profits on freights, and to provide ships and crews as a precaution in case of war. They encouraged industrial employers and shipbuilders either by paying them premiums or by granting them the exclusive right to manufacture or sell certain articles. To prevent competition they imposed very high import duties upon foreign goods or ships. They supported

the commercial companies by granting them the exclusive right to trade in certain regions.

The English Government enjoyed the advantage of exerting an equal authority over all the king's subjects. It made regulations applying to the craftsmen or merchants of the whole realm. It still desired to maintain the existing state of affairs by securing regular work for its subjects, so as to provide plentiful supplies for the benefit of consumers. But modern ideas were leading it to increase its power by getting as much money as possible out of its subjects. It induced Parliament to pass three laws (*statutes*), one compelling all craftsmen and agricultural labourers to work at their own occupation and serve their apprenticeship for seven years; another arresting all beggars and vagabonds and compelling them to work, under severe penalties; and a third compelling the parishes to provide relief for the poor who were incapable of working. It tried to keep the country population bound down to agricultural labour, though it was the most laborious and despised form of work, and to prevent them from rising to a higher position by forbidding apprentices to be taken from any but families with a comfortable competence. It ordered the "justices of the peace" to fix wages annually according to the prices of essential commodities.

The English Government also resorted to the practices which have been known collectively as the "mercantile system." It forbade the import of ironmongery, cutlery, and soap and granted a large number of monopolies. But the regulations intended to uphold the former system of labour were not applied, because the justices of the peace had neither the means nor the desire to do so. Moreover, employers had their goods manufactured in the country districts, which were not subject to the regulations. The monopolies met with a lively opposition from the judges, who declared them to be an infringement of the rights of English subjects to trade freely throughout the whole realm.

The "mercantile" policy was attempted in France at the request of the merchants, who induced the Government to prohibit the import of foreign products, but the prohibition was abrogated because it hampered the trade of Lyons. In Spain the Government tried to forbid the export of silver, but it could do nothing towards founding

The nobles

industries, for it had exterminated or expelled the Moslems, who alone were accustomed to working.

The Dutch, who had no central government controlling economic life, preferred to seek wealth in trade and found it to their advantage to impose no restrictions, in accordance with the saying that "commerce should be free even in hell."

Society

Society evolved in opposite directions in the regions of the west and the east. In the countries of the west and centre, which then contained almost the whole population of Europe, society was still aristocratic and divided up into officially recognized classes. But within the limits of every class there grew up in practice an increasing number of differences of status which made it resemble not so much a series of separate stages as a ladder with a great many rungs, on which an individual or family could rise from one to another with comparative ease. It was in France that this "social scale" had the greatest number of gradations. The description given by Loyseau in 1610 indicates some twenty. The old landed wealth, in which the division into classes had originated, became increasingly exposed to the competition of the new personal wealth in money acquired through trade, industry, or, above all, money-lending, the possessors of which were rising in the social scale.

The nobles

The upper class still consisted of the nobility, descended from warriors and known as the "nobility of the sword," for the sword had become its distinctive weapon and was worn on all occasions. Its superior rank was marked by certain customs: the nobles alone were treated as equals by princes, admitted to the sovereign's court, or appointed to positions of honour in his household or the higher ranks in the army. They were now hardly ever called up in case of war, but continued to ride and hunt. Their superior rank was still hereditary, but their wealth was threatened, for it consisted in nothing but their lands, and they were obliged by custom to "live nobly" — that is, without pursuing any gainful occupation. In France, Spain, and Germany work was regarded as "derogatory," and he who did

anything derogatory lost his noble status. Hence the nobles had no means of increasing their wealth, and since honour compelled them to keep up a standard of living suited to their rank, many of them got into debt and became impoverished.

The nobles were divided into several grades, based upon differences in their mode of life. At the top were the great lords owning vast domains and the favourites whom the king had raised up by grants of land and high positions at court or in the army. Since the fifteenth century the king of France had been granting them the ancient titles borne by extinct princely families (duke, marquis, count, or baron). The same titles were borne in Spain by the *grandees*, numbering a hundred families in Castile, who owned very large estates confiscated from the Moslems in Andalusia. The English *lords* also bore titles of French origin, but during the Wars of the Roses the old families had been destroyed and the king had created new and less powerful ones. After the middle of the sixteenth century the king of Sweden had given French titles to the Swedish lords. In the German lands those who bore the ancient titles had become *de facto* sovereigns and were known as princes (*Fürsten*). Below these should have come the knights, but since the custom of being armed as knights had become extinct, the name had been replaced in Germany by that of *Herr* (lord), in Spanish *don*. In England the king created the new title of *baronet*, which gave the bearer of it the right of being called *sir*. The great mass of the nobles consisted of the ordinary gentlemen or esquires. The richest of them were called lords (French *seigneur*, German *Herr*).

Everywhere except in Italy the nobles, in their capacity as land-owners, continued to have their principal residence in the country. Those of the lords, and sometimes of the richer gentlemen, still bore the old name of *château* (castle), but were gradually ceasing to be fortresses. The moats were filled in, the towers now served only as ornaments, and the very name had come to signify no more than the residence of a great person. The lord had also his mansion in a town, for preference the one in which the prince had his residence. Ordinary gentlemen had only a fortified house, in which most of them led a simple and almost poor life when they had large families. Others took service in an army or entered the personal service of some great lord, forming his mounted bodyguard. In Italy, where

The bourgeois

the nobles lived in the towns, they had a *villa* in the country in which to spend the summer, from which is derived the word *villegiatura*.

The enriched bourgeois had found ways of entering the nobility, sometimes by irregular methods — that is, by purchasing a nobleman's estate and living a gentleman's life upon it, which was easy in England, where the squire had no legal privileges. Others usurped the position of nobles which was tolerated by the local authorities. They also entered it by legal methods, by obtaining a patent of nobility or occupying some office that conferred nobility. This process was particularly frequent in France, where the king sold offices. The ennobled commoners having the right to call themselves esquires formed the lowest category of the nobility, especially in France. Thus the French nobility came to be filled more and more with descendants of ennobled bourgeois, who took the place of the nobility of the sword as it became extinct. In other Continental states such methods of granting nobility were rare, and almost the whole of this class still consisted of hereditary nobles.

The bourgeois

Only one region in Europe, the provinces of Holland and Zeeland, where practically no nobles were left, had an upper class composed of men who were still legally bourgeois. Even when they had become very wealthy, they had not adopted either the costume or the mode of life of nobles, and continued to live in the town in plain houses with middle-class interiors.

Between the nobles and the mass of the people there was an urban upper class, especially in countries where the towns were numerous and rich — Italy, France, and western Germany. It consisted of bankers, legal and financial officials, those practising what were known as the *liberal* professions — lawyers, doctors, professors — and the richer merchants, and had increased in numbers and power. It was to these that the name of bourgeois was reserved in France. It was they who controlled the government of the German towns and shared the power with the nobles in those of Italy. They were not very numerous in Spain, where there were few officials and little trade, or in England and eastern Germany, where the towns were very small.

Whereas in the Middle Ages armed power had brought wealth,

it was now wealth that began to confer power. The city republics of Italy, the Netherlands, and Germany were governed by bourgeois. In France the rich bourgeois, occupying legal or financial offices, exercised much of the royal power. Those of them known as *financiers* (or *traitants*) negotiated large transactions with the State as money-lenders or army contractors and vied in luxury with great lords. Even in England the London merchants had financial dealings with the court and Government. The origin of these fortunes is not precisely known to us: trade was carried on on too small a scale, and saving took too long for the accumulation of large sums. Wealth seems to have been built up rather by banking transactions, dealings in exchange, advances of money to princes, and, above all, loans advanced on security at very heavy interest.

Ecclesiastics

The class of ecclesiastics had been revolutionized by the Reformation. In the lands that had turned Protestant the whole of the regular clergy had disappeared. It was only in the Anglican Church that the bishops had retained their titles, power, and revenues. The deacons had become laymen and all the minor orders had been abolished; only the priests survived, but they had become married *ministers* or *pastors*, who were no longer clearly distinguished from the laity by their costume or mode of life. They entered the universities as students and their appearance resembled that of the lawyers, who also wore robes. In England, where they still received an income from tithes and glebe lands, they lived in the society of gentlemen and were sometimes justices of the peace. The Presbyterian pastors, who were all on an equality, were more independent and active, exerted a greater influence over their flocks, and imposed a more vigorous prohibition on Sunday pleasures. Pastors in all countries had a great many children, and their families formed a new element in society. The liberal professions were largely recruited from among the sons of ministers, and pastors' wives and daughters often took the place of nuns in charitable work.

In Catholic countries the married clergy had disappeared and, except in Spain, the old monastic orders were on the decline. New orders had been founded, living in the towns. The most powerful of these, the Society of Jesus, owned a great many schools in which the

The people

sons of rich families all over the country were educated. It had obtained a great influence over the princes and taken the lead in the movement known as the *Counter-Reformation*, which in Germany had succeeded in bringing all the subjects of the Catholic princes back into the Roman Church, and in France and Poland had succeeded in converting nearly the whole of the Protestant nobility. During the first half of the seventeenth century several congregations of women were established, especially in France, the Ursulines and Visitandines, who founded enclosed convents in which the daughters of well-to-do families were educated, and charitable confraternities devoted to the care of the sick and poor. The priests were now better disciplined, led a more austere life, and performed their duty of instructing believers by preaching and the catechism much more punctiliously. They were beginning to receive some sort of special preparation, though the seminaries prescribed by the Council of Trent took a very long time to start. The upper clergy alone had not changed much; bishops and abbots were still recruited by the favour of princes among the noble families, still obtained dispensations from residence, and lived at court like great lords.

The people

The mass of the people, peasants, craftsmen, and shopkeepers, had changed its way of living far less than the privileged classes. Its methods of work, being fixed by custom, offered no opportunity for enrichment or obtaining an education. Its position had grown even worse as the result of taxation. Agriculture and industry did not suffice to absorb the excess of births, and complaints of the large numbers of vagrants and beggars were heard everywhere. The rise of prices during the sixteenth century pressed hard upon the wage-earners, for wages had been fixed by the authorities and consequently did not rise. In the country districts, devastated by war, the lords, finding their own expenditure increased, imposed heavier dues upon the peasants and enclosed the commons where the latter had pastured their beasts. In the towns the craftsmen were suffering from the competition of manufactories producing on a large scale. The journey-men, no longer able to become masters, remained hired workmen without any right to form associations. There was no lack of strikes during the sixteenth century and they were repressed like crimes.

The mass of manual labourers was coming more and more to consist of two classes, one owning a means of subsistence in the shape of a piece of land or a craft, and the other a miserable class living on nothing but a precarious wage and consisting of agricultural labourers, journeymen, and home-workers.

Eastern Europe

In eastern Europe, where there were few towns and the population was still too sparse to bring the great waste spaces covered with marshes and forests under cultivation, society was evolving in the opposite direction. In Poland, where the small towns were peopled by German colonists, the kings were induced by pressure from the nobles to place restrictions upon the rights of the inhabitants and bring them under the rule of Polish lords. The Germans disappeared, but the German Jews remained, though their religion excluded them from society. No middle class grew up to exercise the profession of craftsmen and merchants, maritime trade was carried on by the self-governing German city of Danzig, and office was reserved to the nobles. The nation was divided into two classes. The *szlachta*, composed of mounted warriors, was far more numerous than any other nobility in Europe and included some very poor families. The peasants (*kmiecy*), who worked as day-labourers on the domain of the nobles or held their land by a precarious tenure, had been reduced to the status of serfs, for they no longer had the right to appear before a court and demand justice.

Russia occupied a position unique in Europe. It had a superabundance of land, but this was valueless unless it was settled with farmers, and since the sixteenth century the tsar had behaved as if it were his property. The great mass of the peasants seems to have been free, except for the compulsory payment of tribute, and they remained free at the two extremities of the land, in the forest region of the north and in the southern plains more recently conquered by the tsar. In the central region the warriors had both slaves who were prisoners of war and free peasants at work upon their domains. Since these were still free to move about and given to changing their residence, the Government, in order to keep up the value of land, ultimately prevented them from moving from one domain to another. This was done, not by an ordinance of the tsar's, as was long supposed,

but by a gradual process, the peasants being tied to the spot by the debts which they had contracted towards the owner of the domain. Having lost the right to leave it, they came in the end to be treated like slaves.

The upper class was still composed of mounted warriors of varied origin, some of them being boyars or great landowners descended from princes, but most of them *pomiestchiks*, owning a domain granted by the tsar for life only on condition of rendering him service. There was no middle class between the warriors and the peasants. Only one city remained, Moscow, the residence of the tsar, to which he had transplanted by force the upper class of the population from the towns that had formerly been independent. The other towns were merely the fortified residences of governors, with a few merchants gathered about the fortress and some craftsmen in the suburbs.

Beliefs

The Renaissance and the Reformation had wrought a transformation in intellectual life. The beliefs common to all churches remained a living force in all classes of society: fear of the Devil and of hell, the belief in demons and those possessed by devils, which the clergy continued to exorcize, as well as certain beliefs dating from pre-Christian times: fear of ghosts and witchcraft, besides astrology and divination, which were very much in favour at the courts of princes and among the nobility. The persecution of witches, begun by the Pope in Germany in 1484, had passed into the hands of secular judges. It took the form of torture and almost always ended in death by burning. The great age of witchcraft trials in every land, Protestant or Catholic, lasted from the end of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth.

Religious instruction, in the form of preaching to adults and the catechism for children, was gradually making the formulas of theology familiar even to the laity. In the Catholic lands the revival of religious sentiment had caused the general adoption of devotional practices, such as saying the rosary, the wearing of scapularies and even the hairshirt, and scourging. Pious exercises were also widely practised — prayer, the Communion and confession (for which the confessional separating the priest from the penitent was invented in Italy). Ardent souls entered into mystical contact with the Deity by

prolonged prayer (*oraison*) and religious meditation, which sometimes took the form of ecstasy. Theology found its way into the conversation even of educated laymen, and even at table there were discussions between persons of various creeds and tendencies especially on the question of grace and predestination, which had a direct bearing upon salvation. The partisans of free will, who believed it possible to win salvation by good behaviour, were known as *latitudinarians* in England and Holland by the partisans of orthodox Calvinism. In France the rigorous doctrine of the *Jansenists*, formulated by a Belgian bishop and approximating very closely to that of Calvin, was combated by the Jesuits, who were inclined to be indulgent towards the sins of the laity.

Intellectual education was still carried on among the privileged classes by two methods. The schools still used the study of the Latin authors as a means of instruction, imparted in a pedantic form and accompanied by a brutal discipline which still resorted to flogging. The education of courtiers and ladies was carried out by the reading of various books: pious works the model for which was set by St. Francis of Sales, and the love romances which were very plentiful after the end of the sixteenth century and especially during the seventeenth. It was completed by conversation among people of birth and men of letters in the *salons*, the original model of which was set up in France by a lady, the Marquise de Rambouillet, whose mother was an Italian.

Science and arts

The sciences were gradually shaking off the habit which had predominated in the alchemy of the sixteenth century, of regarding nature as a vessel containing a supernatural intelligence and forces. During the seventeenth century they definitively adopted a purely rational method, working solely by means of mathematical reasoning, or else by observation of the facts of nature. Their work was rendered possible by the invention of new instruments, the barometer and the telescope, which came from Italy. The foundations of astronomy were laid by a German, Kepler, and an Italian, Galileo, a university professor who also established the underlying principles of physics. A Frenchman, Descartes, discovered a new mathematical method based upon analysis.

Literature, freed from the narrow imitation of the works of antiquity, since it was now intended for a public ignorant of Latin, sought its inspiration in popular forms of art, even when its works bore an antique name. In Spain Cervantes combined the old romance of chivalrous adventure with the *picaresque* novel created during the sixteenth century and describing the life of low adventurers. The *romance*, a product of the Middle Ages, became the favourite form of literature in good society with the *Astrée*, in which love occupied the chief place. The drama had started with popular representations, the religious *mystery* and the *farce*. In England it appealed to a mixed public of nobles and men of the people, for whom Shakespeare wrote; in Spain it had developed into a performance given by amateurs, in which tragedy and comedy were mingled. In France these were separated into the two literary forms of *tragedy*, which was raised to the level of high art by Corneille, and *comedy*, which developed out of farces played at fairs. In all forms of literature love was still the sentiment that lent the work its attraction, but instead of being addressed to the lady, as in the Middle Ages, it had as its subject the young girl of good birth, while still preserving the deferential forms of chivalrous love. It imposed its influence on all the literary forms, including comedy, even when the subject was not suited to it.

The plastic arts still carried on the Renaissance movement. Painting began to abandon antique models and draw closer to nature. Architecture increasingly adopted Italian forms, together with the use of plaster-work in churches and palaces, and imposed the tyranny of the straight line even upon the trees growing in gardens.

Music still had its centre in Italy, where musicians were recruited for all the courts of Europe. It was here that during the seventeenth century the new musical forms were developed which still bear their Italian names: the *oratorio* for religious worship, the *concerto* for amateurs, and the *opera* for worldly society; while the popular song was flourishing in France, and Germany was consolidating her traditions in instrumental music.

THE SECOND HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

•

The general crisis in Europe

Conditions of life for the European peoples had been seriously unsettled by the Reformation and the establishment of absolute monarchies, but settled down again during the second half of the seventeenth century, when the formation of modern Europe was being completed mainly through two political crises of unequal duration. The shorter of these, which was also the more general, took place between 1648 and 1660 simultaneously, though independently, in almost all countries.

The most important crisis, in view of its remoter consequences, was the Revolution in Great Britain, which began as a revolt against the King and ended in the victory of the rebels, who established in England the Presbyterian system of the Church of Scotland. Having defeated the King, the Presbyterian Parliament came into conflict with its own army by refusing to pay it and prohibiting the small sects, known as *Independents*, which had won over most of the soldiers and their general, Cromwell, a country gentleman of a conservative spirit. In 1648 the army, threatened by the Presbyterian majority, expelled it from Parliament and obtained the trial and execution of the King, the abolition of the monarchy, and the establishment of a provisional government known as the *Commonwealth*. This was the first example of a great centralized state in the form of a republic. The officers delegated by the troops to set up a new Constitution formulated a radical theory of government for the first time in Europe, and, though personally attached to tradition, Cromwell could not prevent the insertion in the act passed by the House of the princi-

ple of the sovereignty of the people, governing through representatives elected for a short term. Having fallen out with the members, who refused to authorize elections for a new chamber, Cromwell expelled them and, assuming the old title of *Protector*, attempted to restore a monarchical system, upheld by the army in opposition to almost the whole nation. After his death, however, the army stationed on the Scottish frontier returned to London and restored the King. But this experience left the English with a horror of all permanent armies, which was to deprive the king of the most effective instrument for absolute government.

In the Republic of the United Provinces the Prince of Orange, Stadhouder of six out of seven provinces, and supported by the authorities of all the provinces except Holland, as well as by the soldiers, the navy, the pastors, and the mass of the people even in Holland itself, seized the supreme power by using force against the bourgeois who governed the towns. On his sudden death, leaving only a posthumous son, the party of the Dutch bourgeois again seized the government, under the leadership of the secretary of the province, and made the Government of the Confederation accept a policy of peace and alliance with France. Rivalry between English and Dutch merchants led to the first naval war between England and the United Provinces.

France, while still at war with Spain, was rent by a revolt of the Parisians against Mazarin, the Prime Minister, an Italian and the protector and confederate of the financiers who were making large profits out of their contracts with the State. This revolt, known as the Fronde, started by the Parlement of Paris and continued by the great lords in certain provinces, ended after four years of disorder in the victory of Mazarin, who was left absolute master of the Government and imposed peace upon Spain by the aid of regiments sent by the English Republic.

The Government of Spain succeeded in putting down the Catalans, who had been in revolt for twelve years, but could not prevent Portugal from once more becoming an independent kingdom and regaining her colonies, with the assistance of reinforcements sent from France.

At the other extremity of Europe, in the north-east, Charles X (Charles Gustavus), King of Sweden, already master of Finland,

Louis XIV's enterprises and failure

Estonia, and Livonia, scattered the polish army and occupied almost all Poland. He was driven out by a national revolt of the nobles and attempted the conquest of Denmark. He failed at the siege of Copenhagen, but the peace concluded after his death handed over the Danish provinces in southern Scandinavia to Sweden, which in future extended as far as the Sound. This war in the north had given the Prince Elector of Brandenburg, the vassal of the King of Poland, the chance of becoming sovereign Duke of Prussia.

In the south-east of Europe the vast plain between the Dniester and the Urals, known as the *Ukraine* (frontier region), was occupied by Russian-speaking immigrants belonging to the Orthodox Church, known as Cossacks (wanderers), half peasants, half mounted warriors, who led a life of adventure and pillage in the neighbouring regions. Their chief armed force, organized in regiments, elected its leader (*ataman*), who received the insignia of command from the King of Poland. The Polish Government having decided to recognize only those Cossacks who were entered on the registers and to treat the rest as peasants having no rights, they revolted in 1648 and massacred the Polish nobles and priests. Then, in 1654, feeling too weak to continue the war, the ataman recognized himself as subject to the Tsar, and the Ukraine passed under the authority of the Russian Government.

These events, which were crowded into a very short time, finally upset the balance of power among the states of Europe. The house of Austria lost the preponderance which it had enjoyed for a century and a half. Its Spanish branch was now ruined and no longer strong enough to defend its possessions outside Spain. Its German branch no longer had any real power in Germany, and its dominions were threatened by an invasion of the Ottoman Turks. Poland, driven far back from the Black Sea, was seen to lie open to invasion by the Swedes and Russians. England was beginning to play an active part as a maritime power. The preponderance was passing to France, the ally of the United Provinces, now the richest nation in Europe, and of Sweden, now, thanks to her army, the mistress of the Baltic.

Louis XIV's enterprises and failure

Though the following period, between 1660 and 1715, was much longer, it contained few important events. Central Europe (Germany,

Italy, and the Netherlands) was split up into small, weak states and served as a battlefield for the armies of the great western powers and a field for their intrigues.

This period opened with the rise to power of Louis XIV, who was convinced of his own strength and animated by a desire for glory and conquest. Mazarin had left him with a body of experienced men in charge of the Government; he had as his allies the Dutch, the richest people in Europe, Sweden, which had the strongest army, and most of the German princes, who had long been under the protection of France. He had none but weak enemies: Spain, which was ruined and feebly governed, and the Emperor, who was threatened by the army of the Ottoman Turks, which in 1683 laid siege to Vienna.

Up to the end of the century Louis XIV had as his chief objective the "Spanish succession," which was expected to fall vacant on the extinction of the dynasty, for which he had been waiting ever since the accession of Charles II in 1664; but though this prince was always dying, he lived till 1700. Louis tried to obtain it by a marriage and then by sharing it with the Austrian heir, and in the meantime made war for the purpose of winning a few scraps of it: a few towns in the Netherlands in 1668 and Franche-Comté in 1678.

He had begun to make other powers uneasy, and next started making war on the United Provinces with the aid of the King of England. The invasion of Holland by the French army caused an internal revolution which deprived the party in favour of the French alliance of their power and handed over the government of the United Provinces to William, the young Prince of Orange. Louis XIV's aggressive policy had cost him the Dutch alliance and was alienating the German princes. They agreed among themselves and with the Emperor that the Empire should declare war upon France, and their army invaded Alsace. At first the coalition led by William against the King of France was too weak entirely to stop him, and the peace concluded in 1678 left him in possession of the territories won from Spain. He profited by this to make certain annexations in time of peace, which were sanctioned by the French courts. The states that were threatened did not succeed in agreeing upon the terms of an alliance till 1686, when, after depriving his Calvinist subjects of most of the rights granted them by the Edict of Nantes, Louis XIV re-

voked the edict in 1685, expelled the pastors, and tried to force conversion upon those of the Reformed religion by forbidding them to leave the kingdom under pain of the galleys.

European politics were again violently deranged by a second revolution in Great Britain. Upon his restoration in 1660, Charles II had succeeded in obtaining the election of a Parliament consisting of members (known as *Cavaliers*) belonging to the Anglican party which had supported King Charles I, and this Parliament he did not dissolve for eighteen years. In order to exclude the Presbyterians from public life, it passed a law requiring those performing any public function, even that of elector, to take an oath of adhesion to the Established Church. English gentlemen attached importance to the functions of justice of the peace or member of a municipal body, which lent them influence and consideration in their part of the country, and returned to the Anglican Church in order to keep them. Even up to the present day only the "middle classes" still belong to the Dissenting Churches. Charles II even attempted to convert England to the Catholic religion by granting toleration to both Catholics and Dissenters; but, though devoted to the King, Parliament compelled him to exclude the Catholics by the means already used against the Presbyterians, by requiring them, as a qualification for any public function, to take the "test" — that is, to swear an oath that they rejected the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

Charles II had no children and the conflict that arose over the succession led to an acute crisis which lasted for three years (1678–81) during which the King dissolved three Parliaments. It was now that the two parties took shape between which the English were divided for two centuries: the party in favour of the King's brother, James, and compulsory membership of the Anglican Church (known as Tory), and the party in favour of the exclusion of James as a Catholic and toleration for the Dissenters (known as the Whigs). Charles got rid of Parliament and ruled as an absolute king till his death.

On succeeding to the throne, James revived the project of restoring the Roman Church in England. He granted toleration to the Dissenters, himself attended Catholic worship, and persecuted those who opposed him. He thus alienated all parties, even the Tories, who were attached to the Anglican Church as well as to the royal authority.

He had two Protestant daughters, the elder of whom, married to William of Orange, was to succeed him. But when his second wife, who was a Catholic, bore him a son who was to be brought up as a Catholic, the leaders of the two opposing parties came to an understanding and asked the aid of William of Orange, James's son-in-law, who came to England with a Dutch army and carried out the Revolution, whereupon James fled to France.

Like the previous one, the Revolution of 1688 had arisen out of a religious conflict, but it took a conservative form. It did not proclaim any new principle of government, not even the deposition of James and the election of a new king. It ended in merely setting James's daughter and son-in-law in his place and ensuring that in future every king of England must be a Protestant. As in the Middle Ages, the English Constitution remained a matter of custom, based upon precedents. It was indirectly, by declaring the acts of James to be contrary to the traditional rights of the English, that the "Declaration of Rights" enunciated the practical limitations placed upon the king's rights, and as their sole guarantee it laid down that Parliament must be frequently summoned. As a matter of fact, William, as leader of the coalition against Louis XIV, required an army and a great deal of money so as to make war, and was obliged to summon Parliament annually to induce it to vote taxation and grant the right of trying soldiers before a council of war.

The Revolution had as its immediate consequence war with Ireland, to which James returned with a French army and obtained its recognition of him as king. His defeat had as its result the establishment in Ireland of an exceptional government which reduced the Irish to the position of an inferior class and gave all power and a large part of the land to Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster and to English landowners in other parts of the country.

In Europe the Revolution brought England into the Coalition against Louis XIV, which had so far consisted only of the Empire, Spain, and the United Provinces. The war, which broke out again simultaneously at sea and on all the French frontiers, ruined the fleet and exhausted the King's resources to such an extent that, in spite of three years of victories in Italy and the Netherlands, Louis XIV resigned himself to asking for peace and returned a few of his conquests.

Louis XIV's enterprises and failure

In eastern Europe the Ottoman army which was besieging Vienna in 1683 was driven back by the united armies of the Emperor, the German princes, and the King of Poland. Taking the offensive, the Imperial armies regained from the Sultan the whole territory of the kingdom of Hungary and Transylvania. The peace concluded in 1699 gave the Austrian dynasty the frontiers which it preserved up to the twentieth century.

In 1700 Louis XIV at last obtained the Spanish succession, not for France, which gained no aggrandizement by it, but merely for a prince of his family who became King of Spain. He fell out with England and Holland, which formed a new Coalition with the Emperor and some of the German princes. His armies were defeated and France was invaded. Louis XIV was saved by the rise to power of the Tory party in England, which granted him peace on conditions laid down by the English Government. His grandson remained King of Spain, but all the Spanish possessions in Italy and the Netherlands passed to the house of Austria. Two of the princes who had been allies of the Coalition came out of the war with the title of King: the Duke of Savoy, who became King of Sardinia, and the Elector of Brandenburg, who became King of Prussia, where he already possessed the sovereign power.

Scotland had been united with England in 1707 in a "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland," with a single Parliament and a single flag, that of the Union. Scotland retained its Presbyterian Church and its own private law.

In eastern Europe a warlike prince, Charles XII, King of Sweden, having subdued the whole of Poland, made an expedition into the Ukraine, where he lost his army. The Tsar of Russia defeated him and remained master of the Swedish provinces on the shores of the Baltic. Russia, hitherto separated from Europe by its religion, had been brought abruptly into contact with it on the initiative of the young Tsar, Peter the Great. Instead of being brought up like the Russian tsars, who were accustomed to a life of ceremonial and piety, in accordance with Byzantine tradition, he sought the company of the foreigners settled in a suburb of Moscow and acquired a taste for the material civilization of the West. He tried to impose European costume upon his subjects, abandoned the Russian city of Moscow, had a new capital built near the Baltic in a foreign region won from Sweden by

The central government in the European states

conquest, and called it by a German name: St. Petersburg. He created a fleet on the English model, an army copied from Germany, and a Senate copied from Sweden. He met with no active resistance, for his people were in the habit of passive obedience.

The central government in the European states

With the exception of a few small aristocratic republics, all the states in Europe were monarchies, and all of them, except Poland, hereditary monarchies. The change in the nature of the supreme authority became complete during the seventeenth century. It was no longer bound up with the person of the sovereign, but had now become the impersonal and abstract power of the State and might be exercised in the prince's stead by a lieutenant or deputy, who was obeyed like the prince himself. But the practice now established in Spain and Portugal of delegating all power to a single man was not applied in France. In all states the sovereign insisted upon exercising, or appearing to exercise, his authority, though without giving direct orders to his subjects. After consultation with his confidential advisers the sovereign himself decided, or appeared to decide, affairs that were held to be important, especially relations with other states, leaving to them the detailed work necessary for carrying out his decisions, and usually, too, the duty of keeping him informed on matters concerning the State.

Business was increasingly dealt with in writing, in the form of dispatches, reports, and memoranda. In the German lands and Sweden his assistants were grouped in several councils, each in charge of one department of business, the prince acting as a link between them. In France and England the king no longer made use of official councils, but brought together a few confidential advisers, bearing various titles, in his *cabinet*, for the intimate discussion of affairs. These men were beginning to be known as *ministers* and to share the various classes of business among them.

In the states of eastern Europe the authority of the sovereign had been weakened by exceptional, though often temporary, conditions. In Sweden the power had been exercised during the long minority of Charles XI by a regency consisting of high dignitaries. But on attaining his majority Charles availed himself of the unpopularity of the aristocracy to appeal to the three lower orders in the Diet (the clergy, bourgeois, and peasants) and restore the absolute power, which his

successor used according to his own caprice. In Hungary the great lords, who were secretly in communication with the Sultan and Louis XIV, had conspired against the King-Emperor. Having conquered the land, he ordered a great many executions and tried to restore the power of the king and the Church, but failed to suppress the Diet, which adhered to its custom of granting no levies of men or money till after negotiation with the king. In Poland the king was elected by the assembly of all the nobles, and no political decision could be arrived at except by consent of the Diet, the voting in which had to be unanimous. In Russia the patriarch and the tsar, who shared the government, had allowed a sort of council of government to be established during the seventeenth century, the Duma of the boyars. But no form of authority could establish itself except by consent of the tsar, and the will of the Tsar Peter was strong enough to restore absolute power more thoroughly than in any other state.

The change in the character of the monarchy was marked by a change in the sovereign's mode of life. Except in Sweden, he ceased to take a direct part in war. He also ceased to lead the itinerant life necessary in the days when he had had to give his orders in person. He settled down in a palace, where his servants and visitors formed a permanent court about his person. Except in Sweden, he ceased to wear military uniform, but dressed like a court nobleman and, like Louis XIV and the Emperor Leopold II, wore a wig after the fashion of lawyers and drove in a coach.

The use of his time was regulated by a ceremonial known as court *etiquette*, invented in the fifteenth century at the court of the Duke of Burgundy and in the sixteenth century transported to the court of Spain, where it became even more rigid. Leopold introduced it at the court of Vienna, and Louis XIV, having built a palace in the Italian style at Versailles, imposed an etiquette contrary to the traditions of the court of France, where life had always been free, gay, and even irregular. Every act of the King's daily life, his rising (*lever*), his meals, his going to bed (*coucher*), was transformed into a ceremony at which the courtiers were silent spectators. This etiquette became the fashion at all courts, especially those of the German princes, each of whom desired, like Louis XIV, to have a residence outside the city, a ceremonial, courtiers, and sometimes, too, official mistresses known as *maîtresses en titre*.

The ecclesiastical authority

By the sixteenth century the authority of the clergy, even in the Catholic countries, was subordinate to the power of the prince. With the exception of the Inquisition, which had remained independent in Spain and Portugal, the ecclesiastical courts were no longer co-ordinate with but subordinate to the sovereign's secular courts. They no longer tried criminal cases, and their jurisdiction was now limited mainly to those connected with marriage. The pope remained a sovereign and independent prince, but no longer claimed the power of deposing kings or had any influence on the policy of sovereigns, save in matters concerning the internal organization of the Church.

Yet even in the Protestant countries the clergy preserved some authority over believers in matters affecting them materially. Religious practices, attendance at public worship, the catechism, and, in Catholic countries, confession, the cessation of work on feast-days (which were still very numerous) and abstinence from meat were still obligatory, on pain of fines and even of prison. The practice of any worship other than that of the State Church was forbidden by law, save for those few exceptions established by an official act of the sovereign in favour of those of the Reformed faith. These were abolished in Poland during the sixteenth century and in France by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and survived only in Hungary. The English Government made special laws for the punishment of *recusants* — that is, Dissenters or Papists (Catholics) who did not attend the Anglican services. In point of fact, though the prohibited religions did not always enjoy toleration, the judicial authorities took no very active steps to search them out in the United Provinces or even in England, except in times of crisis. Since the Revolution of 1688, special laws had been passed granting toleration to Protestant Dissenters in the form of exemptions from the penalties incurred by them, and they were allowed to perform public functions on condition of attending public worship once a year. By the seventeenth century repressive measures in the German lands had come to be limited to expelling the dissentient elements from the territory of the State, allowing them to take their goods with them and sell their real property, and the treaties of 1648 contained an article providing that if a prince changed his religion, he must leave his subjects free to exercise their own. In all

states the clergy still kept the registers of baptisms, marriages, and deaths, the only record of people's status as citizens. It also supervised the schools and hospitals and had control of poor-relief.

The procedure of public life

Governments retained a certain respect for custom and accepted rights, which prevented them from officially abolishing independent organs of authority. They preferred to create new ones which attracted business into their own hands, leaving the outward honours to the existing institutions, but without the power. The result was a collection of incongruous and varied institutions which make it very difficult to characterize this system.

The direct agents of the Government were recruited by various methods which had already become fixed. In England it was the chief landowners of each region who performed the functions of government. This constituted a local autonomy, known later as *self-government*, controlled by the country gentlemen. In France the rich bourgeois in every part of the country performed these functions without strictly obeying the Government. The result was a virtual autonomy controlled by the bourgeois of the towns. To reduce this too independent body of men to obedience, the Government had already made it a general practice to send out commissaries removable at will and provided with almost unlimited powers, known as *intendants*, who were, however, chosen from among the lawyers possessing offices. Under Louis XIV the custom grew up of appointing one for every *généralité* (financial area). In the other Continental states there were far fewer agents, appointed by the prince and removable. On the territories of the German princes two categories of officials still existed, one in charge of the prince's domain, the other of the war chest. The Elector of Brandenburg, who kept up an army of thirty thousand men, a heavy charge upon his slender resources, created "war commissaries" charged with the maintenance of the troops and fortresses, with extensive powers analogous to those of the French intendants. He divided his territory into "circles" and appointed a *Landrat* for each of them, a great noble and landowner, who was charged with controlling relations between the troops and the inhabitants.

Everywhere, except in Poland and Hungary, justice was administered in the king's name by his agents, who were officials, or

owned their office, according to the forms current in each particular country. As regards procedure, a difference still existed between England and other countries. The English, loyal to custom, retained the jury formed of local notables under the direction of a royal judge, which sat in public and did not use torture. The accused man could only be detained in prison by order of a judge, who had power to allow him his liberty on depositing bail. The other states had adopted a secret procedure in criminal causes, giving the judge power to keep the accused man in prison indefinitely, put him to the torture so as to extort a confession, and condemn him without allowing him counsel for his defence or a public hearing. From the Middle Ages there survived the frequent use of flogging, mutilation, and the death penalty aggravated by suffering, breaking on the wheel, and quartering, for the purpose of striking terror into the spectators by the sight of the execution. (Hence the name of "exemplary punishment".) To enable the crowd to see this example more clearly, the execution took place on a *scaffold*. The practice also survived of punishing the corpse, cutting it in pieces, dragging it on a hurdle, and casting it forth on the public highway.

The king's financial agents continued to apply the procedure fixed by custom for determining, assessing, imposing, collecting, expending, and auditing the taxes, which had become the principal resource of the State in almost every land. Direct taxation, the form most often adopted in the agricultural countries (in which almost the whole population of Europe was then to be found), was borne mainly by the population of the country districts. It was assessed by the responsible local authorities either upon land, on which it was still a fixed charge, or else upon the family, according to its presumed means. Indirect taxation, which was preferred in commercial countries, fell upon the urban population and took the form of a tax on articles of consumption, especially food and drink. The model for it was set by the Dutch excise duties.

Most governments spent as noblemen did, regardless of their resources, and lived in a permanent state of deficit, loaded with debt and resorting to expedients of every kind. Certain German princes, and especially the Elector of Brandenburg, managed to keep their finances in order by administering their domains on an orderly system. The bourgeois governments of the Dutch towns managed to adjust their

expenditure to their revenues and were able to borrow at very low interest (as little as two per cent). The English Government, whose military expenditure was small, managed to balance its expenditure and revenue. Its wars against Louis XIV compelled it to issue loans guaranteed by the State, which were the origin of the permanent National Debt.

The army and diplomacy

The foreign policy of states was carried on by military operations and the negotiations of diplomatists. War was changing its character, owing to a new organization of the troops and new modes of fighting. The powerful states had ceased, on entering a war, to improvise an army raised by contract, and even in time of peace kept up a standing army with a permanent cadre of officers appointed by the prince. In theory this was still composed of volunteers of all nations, hired in return for pay; but before the end of the seventeenth century armies had become so large that volunteers no longer sufficed. The officers charged with raising them resorted to trickery or even violence. In England the army was small enough to find volunteers, but the navy was already recruited by means of *press-gangs* which carried off men of the lower classes by force. In France the King founded a "provincial militia" as early as 1690, made up of men chosen by lot from every parish and led by gentlemen from the same region. In Russia Peter commanded the lords to hand over peasants from their domains, whom he enlisted for life as soldiers.

The officers in all armies were henceforth appointed by the prince, who granted them a commission that was revocable in theory. In all countries the military profession was still reserved in principle for the nobility of the sword. The officers were almost all gentlemen.

The Government still entrusted the officers with the payment of their men and sent commissaries to review the troops, so as to verify whether the effectives declared to exist by the officers were really present. For some time the officers continued to have the missing men's place taken by their lackeys and to return them as casualties after a battle. The most important innovation was that by which the duty of equipping, feeding, and maintaining the troops was no longer left to the soldiers themselves or their leaders. The Government had arsenals for arms, magazines for equipment, victualling, and forage, and

had barracks built for the accommodation of the troops. The soldiers no longer required to live upon the country or to be encumbered with carts, servants, and women, as they had been during the Thirty Years' War, but the officers still had their own personal baggage-train. But it was still the custom not to conduct military operations in winter, except on rare occasions.

Armaments were changing with the progress of technical methods, which made the discharge of firearms more effective. Iron armour was now no longer capable of resisting them and was abandoned. The cavalry that remained fought chiefly with the sword or carbine, and light cavalry, armed with the sabre and lance — Croats and Hussars — was hired from eastern Europe. The infantry was completely changed when the matchlock with its match or fuse was replaced by the lighter flintlock, and the pike by a mere bayonet, which was originally stuck into the muzzle of the gun, but after the invention of the socket was fixed round the barrel. The *fusilier*, thus provided with both a firearm and a side-arm, took the place of both the musketeer and the pikeman. At the same time began the use of the *hand-grenade*, thrown by picked infantrymen known as *grenadiers*.

Fortification also underwent a change for similar reasons. The stone wall, which had been raised to the greatest possible height in order to prevent an escalade, could no longer withstand projectiles from the improved cannon. Its place was taken by the "rasant" fortifications, already employed by the Dutch armies and those of the sultan, and perfected by Vauban, an engineer in the service of the King of France. The stone wall, built up from the bottom of the fosse, stopped short at the level of its upper edge in such a way as to be entirely hidden by the outer side of the fosse (the counterscarp), and was covered by a mass of earth in which the projectiles buried themselves.

The Dutch method of war, adopted by Louis XIV, had as its aim to capture fortresses, and battles were used either to force the besiegers to raise a siege or to drive off the army which had come to the rescue of the fortress. The result of this system was that a large portion of the troops was immobilized in garrisoning fortresses, and war was reduced to frontier operations in which even successes did not produce any decisive results. It was only after 1700 that two Coalition generals, Marlborough and Prince Eugene, and in eastern Europe Charles

XII, King of Sweden, revived the method of a war of invasion, leading up to a decisive battle.

The organization of diplomacy was completed at the Congress of Westphalia, which created precedents in matters of procedure and determined the precedence due to the representatives of the various states. It worked according to already established usages and in a Machiavellian spirit, and developed into an art practised by virtuosos and using flattery and presents as its means, especially at the small courts. The French succeeded the Italians as masters of this art. The instructions given to their ambassadors were models in this style. They caused all Europe to adopt French as the language of diplomacy instead of Latin.

Conditions of material life

Material conditions did not vary much at this period. The population does not seem to have changed in Italy or multiplied in Germany till after the end of the seventeenth century, but it became a little larger in England and the Netherlands. The means of existence increased only very slowly. Agriculture made no noticeable progress except in Holland, where the offal from the towns served as manure for the new forage crops: clover, sainfoin, and mangels, which made it possible to do without the fallow periods and to fatten beasts in winter. These progressive methods were beginning to find their way into England through the translation of Dutch treatises on agriculture into English.

Industrial labour was still hampered by regulations that discouraged innovation, and continued to be carried on chiefly by artisans in the towns and home-workers living in the country and partly employed as agricultural labourers. Industries making use of a furnace or a powerful machine, such as mining, paper-making, printing, porcelain- and pottery-manufacture, or that of looking-glasses, had to collect quite a large number of men in the same workshop, but they gave but little employment. Most establishments in which a number of workmen were employed at a time were used to keep persons with no means of subsistence, orphans, beggars, or paupers, in confinement and force them to work under compulsion, according to the system already started in England by the *workhouses*.

It was only in Holland and London that wholesale trade was begin-

ning to be separated from banking. Capital was scarce, and the children of an enriched tradesman preferred to give up his business and buy land. In England it was not till after the Revolution of 1688 that a group of men grew up who owned fortunes consisting in securities. Holland, the only country without a nobility, in which the bourgeois enjoyed consideration and power, was the only one in which rich people were in the habit of investing their money in trade or leaving it on deposit in a bank. Part of it would be invested in loans issued by some city, or even abroad in State bonds or English securities. Holland was the great market for capital and it became so abundant that in 1680 Amsterdam was able to lower the interest on its debt to three per cent, at a time when the rate was seldom less than six per cent and stood at ten per cent in almost every country.

In London businesses on a large scale, requiring a permanent capital, were tending more and more to assume the form of a company, the partners in which confined themselves to providing part of the capital and receiving a share in the profits, without incurring any personal risk — a system which already contained the principle of the limited-liability company. This type of company became frequent in England, especially after the Revolution of 1688, up to the panic of 1720, when credit became more abundant owing to the foundation of banks, and speculation in commodities and shares more active. It had the advantage of making the company independent of the personality of its shareholders and obviating the risk of the company's being dissolved and the capital divided up between its members. It provided a means of raising capital for a state loan more easily. The shareholders were now not even compelled to tie up their capital, but could recover it by selling their shares. With the removal of earlier formalities, sales were easily effected on the London Stock Exchange. This new form was the one assumed by those two great English enterprises, the East India Company and the Bank of England, founded by royal charter in 1694, as well as by insurance companies, most of the banks, and even certain industrial enterprises. In France, on the other hand, where those with money preferred to use it for purchasing offices, trading companies on the Dutch model were founded on the initiative of a minister, Colbert, who compelled traders to join them by securing them a monopoly.

Influence of the State upon economic life

The public authorities were in the habit of regulating production and trade, and governments did not openly break with this tradition. Even in England they continued to issue detailed regulations for the manufacture of stuffs, to prohibit certain machines and forbid the export of wheat. But in the conflict between the contradictory interests of their subjects they were led to change sides. What consumers demanded was plentiful supplies and low prices for all the products of agriculture and industry. What the manufacturers demanded was high prices and measures for the elimination of competition. What the merchants desired was to buy at a low price and sell at a high one in order to make the greatest profit out of the difference, and they wanted measures for the removal of competition.

Since the middle of the seventeenth century governments had been using old measures for a new purpose, which suggested to them a system based on principles common to all states. What they sought was no longer plentiful supplies, except of things necessary in case of war: arms, saltpetre, and wood for naval construction. The thing to which they attached the greatest importance was power, and the surest way of obtaining it was through money, which provided the means for buying everything, even soldiers. The intention of studying how to acquire power through wealth can be seen in the term "*political economy*," invented by a Frenchman. The question was studied chiefly by Englishmen, who had been expounding their views in pamphlets as early as the sixteenth century. Colbert, the only French minister who was not a lawyer, was the only one who took an interest in commerce. His conception of economic policy was known later as the "mercantile theory."

The mercantilist school

Colbert started with the common-sense idea that "an abundance of gold and silver constitutes the whole power of a State." Hence the object was to obtain as much money for the State as possible. The men of those days had been impressed by two contrasting examples. Spain received money direct from America, yet remained poor; the money did not stay there, but drained away like rain from a roof. Holland owned no mines, yet was the country in which money was

most plentiful and which carried on the biggest trade with foreign parts. Hence the wealth of the State lay not so much in mines as in a people enriched by trade. There was, indeed, no advantage in its amassing money for the future, for the Asiatic lands whose princes possessed immense treasures were very poor. If it were to require money, it would raise it by means of taxation or a loan.

To obtain money by trade with foreign lands, it was necessary to sell them more than was purchased from them. The governments applied to peoples the procedure already adopted in Italy in the relations between towns. Each state compared itself to a commercial house competing with others for the possession of money. The state which sold for a larger sum than that for which it had bought increased its store of money and grew wealthier; if it did the opposite, it decreased its store and grew poorer. When purchases and sales were equal, trade was compared to a perfectly balanced pair of scales; when trade produced a surplus of cash, the balance tipped in the country's favour; and when foreign purchases exceeded sales, it tipped against the country. Hence it was advantageous to sell, for preference, industrial products part of whose value consisted in the labour of the people in the country, and hence to manufacture the greatest possible quantity. But to sell abroad, it was necessary to be able to offer goods at the lowest possible prices, and hence to spend as little as possible upon their manufacture and pay the lowest possible wages.

Governments sought to increase foreign trade and shipping and the production of luxury goods. Faced with opposing interests, they took the side of the traders and industrialists against consumers and workmen. They adopted the same procedure as the towns of the Middle Ages, though with a different object. They no longer forbade the export of a country's products, but the import of industrial products from foreign lands. They ceased to prohibit the export of gold and silver. They no longer collected duties on the export of goods from the country, but on the import of foreign merchandise. The *customs* served not only to raise money for the State, but, above all, to protect native industry against foreign competition. Shipping was protected by imposing high dues upon foreign ships, or even by forbidding their use. The English "navigation acts" prohibited the transport of a country's merchandise in other than English ships manned by English crews. The Board of Trade was created for the

purpose of finding means of speeding up shipbuilding, encouraging commercial transactions, and closing the colonies to all but the products of English industry.

By this policy the State overthrew the rules of conduct followed by the mediæval authorities, whose ideal it had been to secure a regular and stable means of subsistence for the workers sufficient to enable them to live in accordance with their station in life, while observing the rules of morality and religion. Its object now was to induce those in possession of money to undertake enterprises for obtaining unlimited gain by any means. The State encouraged employers to exploit workmen by lowering wages to such a point as to reduce them to destitution and congratulated them upon making children work, even at the age of only five. It encouraged privateering, the slave-trade, and slavery in the colonies. It permitted loans on interest, which were condemned by the Church, and confined itself to limiting the rates of interest. It tolerated Dissenters because they were useful workmen in trade and industry, and the Jews because they brought capital into the country. Holland, the most mercantile of countries, was the most indifferent in matters of religion, and the Dutch merchant had the reputation of being a bad Christian.

Changes in society

Society, divided into fixed classes by ancient custom, showed little change. Families enriched by favourable conditions entered a higher class, but the middle classes remained the same.

In all countries, with the exception of Holland, the large majority of the population consisted of peasants. On the lowest level were day-labourers earning a wage, the numbers of whom were probably increasing. In eastern Europe the peasants were at the mercy of the nobles whose domains they cultivated.

The standard of living was still wretched in eastern Europe, and very low even in the western lands. Most dwelling-houses were low, thatched cottages without floors or windows, smoky and poorly heated. The position of the manual labourers employed in industry does not seem to have improved. The growth of business enterprises had increased the proportion of workers receiving a wage not only insufficient to support life, but also precarious, for it depended upon the contractor's very irregular orders. The authorities only intervened

to prevent workmen from acting in concert and left employers free to regulate all conditions of work. Almost all workmen were home-workers, and a large proportion of them lived in the country.

Among the lower orders of society those whose position improved most were servants in the employment of great lords or rich bourgeois — valets, butlers, footmen, housekeepers, and chambermaids. They had no expenses for board, lodging, or clothing, and their intimate relations with their employers brought them profits which were sometimes considerable. They were able to save, which provided them with the means of setting up as small tradesmen or lending money at usury.

The bourgeoisie in the French sense of the word, corresponding to the English middle classes, included all those whose profession enabled them to acquire wealth or considerable comfort or required a professional education and work involving much writing, to which nobles refused to be bound down; those engaged in industrial and commercial enterprises, lawyers, physicians, and those landowners who were not nobles but lived upon the income from their land. The numbers of these were increasing and their status had risen, especially in Holland and London and in countries where the princes had multiplied the number of officials, especially France. This intermediate class did not exist in eastern Europe, where tradesmen were still men of the people.

In every country the nobles were still the upper class, enjoying official privileges. The court nobility was becoming increasingly distinct from the mass of ordinary gentlemen still living in the country, and spent part of its time about the residence of the prince. The court nobles wore costumes adorned with ribbons and laces and went about in coaches or sedan-chairs. In the country they had transformed their residences from castles into villas in the Italian style, having a garden planted with trees clipped into the semblance of a wall, adorned with statues and beautified with pools and fountains.

Italian politeness and French gallantry were making their way into the courts and high society of other lands. The art of conversation, which came from Italy, had become acclimatized in France and perfected by contact with men of letters. It formed the attraction of the *Salon*, a French usage which was beginning to spread throughout Europe and in which the ladies set the tone. The privileged classes were

growing accustomed to social relations between the sexes, which were to constitute an original characteristic of European life, in contrast with the manners of all the rest of the world.

Manners were growing more elegant; people in good society no longer helped themselves at table by dipping their hands into the dish. The fork, an Italian invention, had come into use by the middle of the seventeenth century. But even in the upper classes life still had a barbarous side. The streets were still narrow and winding, had no sidewalks, and were littered with refuse, for there were no sewers or privies, and they were so badly paved that those using them sank in the mud. In spite of luxurious clothing, furniture, and carriages, cleanliness was unknown even among lords and great ladies, except, perhaps, among the rich bourgeois of Holland; washing apparatus was very small and baths were no longer customary. Nobody thought of taking any hygienic precautions, epidemics were still frequent and devastating, especially the smallpox, and medicine, which made an excessive use of bleeding and low dieting, did as much harm as good.

Intellectual life

All the Christian creeds had preserved certain common religious beliefs: the power of Satan, the corruption of human nature, predestination and grace, and the conception of a Church outside which salvation was impossible. These were beginning to be shaken, not among the mass of the people, but, for varying reasons, in certain individuals. Humanism, especially in Italy, had adopted the idea of the philosophers who recommended people to live "according to nature." Cultivated men, especially in Holland and England, were reluctant to believe that God was pitiless and indifferent to good behaviour, and desired to allow some scope for human liberty. The progress of sciences based upon observation was accustoming men to the idea of natural laws, as opposed to miracles. Great lords and some men of letters, especially in France, who were known as "*esprits forts*" (the strong-minded), were repelled by pious practices, abstinence, and the prohibition of pleasures, and some went as far as atheism. In the Catholic countries, where repressive measures were still severe, this opposition remained secret or took the form of a discreet scepticism. But the decrease in exorcisms and witchcraft trials shows that fear of the Devil was waning.

The decisive shock took place in two countries where the Government allowed the exercise of two different forms of worship: first in Holland and then in England. Those belonging to the official Church might observe that Dissenters, though guilty of practices condemned by the legally constituted authorities, were not criminals but useful members of society, and conducted themselves at least as well as orthodox believers; whence they drew the conclusion that it was possible to be honest with different religions. Since they did not like to think that an honest man might be damned, they were led to admit that the honest man may win salvation through any religion, a proposition condemned by the Catholic Church and reprobated by the orthodox members of the Reformed religion, under the name of "indifferentism." As early as 1690 Locke, in his *Letters on Toleration*, declared that "every man has the right to worship God in the way which he believes most efficacious for his salvation." Hence the Government ought not to impose any form of worship, but should leave every individual free to choose his own religion.

Freedom of religion implied diversity of belief. It broke the unity of faith, which had been the foundation of Christian society for the last twelve centuries. At the same time the attempt of certain English theologians to found religion upon reason led to that *deism* which was to prepare the way for the great religious revolution of the eighteenth century.

In Russia the official Church abolished certain small differences of ritual introduced during the Tatar domination, whereupon believers attached to the ancient forms split off from the Church, adopting the name of "Old Believers," and formed a dissident body (*Raskol*) which was persecuted by the Government. They were men of the people, peasants or merchants, and their dissent represented a protest of Russian traditional feeling against innovations from abroad.

In the sciences creative work was not carried on at the universities (except that of Leiden in Holland), but by learned men working in isolation, and was accessible only to a very small non-professional public. In England they combined to form a "Royal Society" under the patronage of the King, interested chiefly in the physical and natural sciences, whereas the French Academy was concerned with language and literature. The decisive progress in science took place in the northern lands before the end of the century. The invention of the

microscope, which took place in Holland, provided the means of observing the invisible phenomena of life and hence of discovering the principles of comparative anatomy and physiology. In England Harvey discovered the fundamental fact of the circulation of the blood. Newton based celestial mechanics upon the principle of gravity. Leibnitz, a German, completed the revolution in mathematics begun by Descartes by inventing the infinitesimal calculus.

Literature had felt the effects of the crisis that had occurred in the middle of the century. Milton's religious poem, a great English work, still bore the mark of the feeling which had inspired the Great Rebellion. In France the writers who lent renown to the beginnings of Louis XIV's personal rule, Molière, Boileau, Racine, and La Fontaine, were a continuation of the Renaissance in the sense that they believed themselves to be the imitators of the ancients and gave their works the names of the literary forms of antiquity (comedy, tragedy, epistles, satires, fables), but their feeling was modern and French. They expressed their ideal by one or the other of two contradictory terms: "nature" and "reason." French literature became a model for the imitation of all Europe, even England up to the Revolution. French became the language of courts and high society, and was to remain so throughout the eighteenth century.

The plastic arts, paralysed by the imitation of models and the tyranny of rules, were hardly producing any original works, save in Holland. Music was still an Italian art, the most celebrated musician, Lulli, being an Italian in the service of France, while the German princes preferred to employ musicians coming from Italy. But in Germany Bach's great school of instrumental music was already beginning.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

•

The eighteenth century (or, more exactly, the three quarters of a century from 1715 to 1789) was a period when the conditions of life, political, social, or religious, appeared to be fixed and underwent little change, yet during which a profound revolution in political life, society, and religion was in preparation.

Political life

The states of Europe fell into four groups of very unequal size, according to their different political systems.

The smallest but the most advanced in political evolution consisted of Great Britain and the United Provinces, which as the result of a religious revolution had established a system of government under which the subject enjoyed the greatest liberty and the power of the Government and clergy had become weakest. They had, moreover, adopted the most efficacious methods in agriculture, industry, trade, and credit.

The political system of Great Britain was going through a process of change without precedent in the world's history as the result of exceptional conditions due to a series of accidents. The Revolution of 1688 had neither set precise limits to the king's power nor provided practical guarantees against a return to absolutism, then the normal form of monarchy. The great majority of the ruling classes, the *gentry* and the Anglican clergy, made up the *Tory* party, which was prepared to obey the king and allow him a very wide exercise of his power (known as his *prerogative*). The *Whig* party, which desired to set limits to the royal power, was merely a coalition, led by a few lords, between a number of small minorities: Dissenters, threatened

with exclusion from political life, Scotch Presbyterians, London business men interested in the maintenance of the Debt, and officers, who were partisans of war.

The Tory party was in power when the Stuart dynasty came to an end, but found itself split in two, a large part of it remaining attached to the Catholic Pretender, the dethroned King's son, while the other was unwilling to accept any but an Anglican. The new King, belonging to the German dynasty of Hanover, could not count upon the Tory party, which was favourable to the royal power, to carry on the government; he was therefore obliged to call in the aid of the Whigs, although they were hostile to his power. Being a foreigner and unable even to speak English, he did not appear at the meetings of the ministers, but adopted the habit of keeping in touch with affairs through one of them, who came to act as a prime minister. Thus the real government passed into the hands of a *cabinet*, formed of ministers chosen from both Houses of Parliament. Whereas in all other states the king chose his ministers among his courtiers or officials, the British Government was composed of men independent of the king and capable of resisting him. This did not yet constitute a parliamentary government, with ministers dependent upon Parliament, for the king retained the power of choosing and dismissing his ministers, but it was difficult for him to use it, for he needed ministers who could persuade their colleagues in Parliament to vote the taxation necessary for the expenses of the court and army.

The Cabinet was as yet only an expedient with no legal character, and is not mentioned either by Blackstone, who in 1760 expounded the theory of English public law, or in Montesquieu's description of the government of England. When, resuming the normal practice of all monarchs, the third King of the family, George III, wanted to choose his own ministers and govern in person, he easily managed to find docile ministers and governed for twelve years without any attempt at resistance on the part of Parliament. This return to personal power failed, but only as the result of an accident — that is, the successful revolt of the American colonists, which compelled the King to appoint ministers acceptable to Parliament, in which, as it happened, the party favourable to the royal power had just obtained a majority, which it continued to enjoy for half a century.

The Republic of the United Provinces still retained its compli-

cated system of government, by which the power was divided between the local authorities of the provinces and towns, which were too weak to maintain an absolute government. A revolution caused by the French invasion of 1747 established a semi-monarchical regime by setting up a single Stadhouder with increased powers.

All the monarchical states in western and central Europe — Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, Germany, and Denmark — were subject to a hereditary absolute power consolidated by a long tradition of obedience. The sovereign, whether king or prince, governed with the assistance of auxiliaries chosen at his own pleasure among either his favourites or the body of his officials. He made use of them in different ways according to his fancy, either allowing them to govern in his name, in the Spanish fashion, or using them as clerks for preparing business the decision on which he reserved to himself. These agents were organized on two systems which had grown up during the seventeenth century. The Romance-speaking lands — France, Portugal, and Italy — had ministers each in charge of a department and sometimes meeting in a cabinet. The German states set at the head of each department a council which acted as a collective ministry.

Whether power was exercised by a prince or his ministers, it had everywhere become absolute and impersonal. The government was arbitrary; it decided all questions and gave all orders without consulting the people or accounting to them for its actions, about which it did not even always inform them. Where assemblies still existed, they were reduced to a mere formality. Government was secret, discussion of public affairs was prohibited, and the printing of any document without the permission of a commission of censorship was forbidden under very severe penalties. This system was completed and strengthened during the eighteenth century, during which service of the prince was increasingly becoming a function of State and a regular profession. The officials, having unlimited power at their disposal, worked towards increasing and extending the power of the prince, which was also their own. They multiplied regulations, orders, or prohibitions and adopted more and more complicated measures for supervising the actions of the people, anticipating their intentions, and preventing protests, demonstrations, and meetings.

This system of government (known in German as the *Polizeistaat*, or police State) had as its essential characteristic the activity of the

Enlightened despotism

he set up a hierarchy of fourteen ranks, rising from the lowest subordinates to the highest dignitaries. He carried absolute power to greater lengths than in the European monarchies, where the succession was regulated in advance by provisions independent of the sovereign's will, by abolishing all rules for the succession and providing that the reigning tsar was to appoint his own successor.

During almost the whole of this century the sovereigns were women, brought up in the European fashion, speaking French or German and living in St. Petersburg, surrounded by nobles partly of German origin, who continued to imitate the institutions of European monarchies. It was Catherine, a German, who completed Peter's work. She divided the whole Empire into governments and districts, and instituted "assemblies of the nobility" on the German model, municipal bodies for the towns, and craft corporations.

Enlightened despotism

The means already adopted by governments in the seventeenth century for making their power felt now became more effective. The judicial system adopted no changes in procedure, but was served by a more capable police. The receipts of the State increased with the growth of wealth, while taxation was still so distributed as not to affect the privileged classes. Expenditure was rising, especially that required for the army. It came to exceed the revenue, and in almost all states the finances were still embarrassed. Prussia, the poorest of the monarchies, was distinguished for the rigid economy of its kings, who did not keep up a court, administered their small state like a private domain, and spent almost all their revenues on the maintenance of an army which won Prussia the status of a great power.

In the second half of the century a few sovereigns and several ministers began to adopt a new conception of the functions and duties of the head of a state, inspired by the "philosophic" ideas then in fashion, and sometimes by the new humanitarian feeling as well. They no longer regarded themselves merely as the masters of a state whose duty it was to bring them power and glory. They proclaimed themselves the servants of the State, whose duty it was to work for the public weal by improving conditions of life for their peoples. This led them to lighten taxation or distribute it more equitably, reform judicial procedure and mitigate penalties, cease persecuting Dis-

senters, tolerate religious differences, and even encourage charitable institutions.

This tendency was shared by Frederick II of Prussia, Joseph II of Austria, Leopold of Tuscany, and, at times, Catherine of Russia. They desired to promote the happiness of their people, but they did not mean to allow their subjects any share in government or any political liberty. They relaxed the restraint exercised by the ecclesiastical authorities, but maintained the absolute power of the secular sovereign. Their mode of government has been known as "enlightened despotism."

Armies and foreign policy

Armies were still made up, in theory, of volunteers enlisted by recruiting officers, partly among foreigners, and receiving pay. The officers were almost all gentlemen, in accordance with the tradition that war is the profession of the nobility. They were appointed by the prince, who granted them a commission which was theoretically revocable, though, as a matter of fact, they retained their functions and were even allowed to appoint their successor. The State provided not only pay, but arms, equipment, and uniforms, which had come into general use. It maintained magazines for supplying victuals, munitions, and equipment, and a train of vehicles for their transport. The infantry, armed with the flintlock and bayonet, had become the principal arm. It manœuvred in a serried mass of no great depth, all firing a salvo simultaneously, for its orders were not to take separate aim.

The soldiers, recruited among the poorest classes, who joined the army for lack of any other means of subsistence, went through a long training in time of peace, consisting of constant drill in the use of arms, shooting, marching in time, and manœuvring in companies, so that they might form a mass working like a machine even on the field of battle. This system was carried to perfection in the Prussian army. To accustom the men to passive obedience, even in face of danger, and prevent them from deserting, they were subject to a very severe discipline, consisting of corporal punishment for all faults affecting their service, and the death penalty for disobedience and desertion. Frederick laid down the principle of this when he said that the soldier ought to be more afraid of his officer than of the enemy.

Foreign policy continued to be dominated by the character of military operations. Armies had to be recruited and equipped entirely at the expense of the State. They were very costly, and since it was difficult to replace them, governments hesitated to risk them in enterprises of any magnitude. Being anxious to keep up communications with their sources of supply, generals manœuvred prudently and slowly, carrying out their operations over a limited area and with a limited objective. Armies were too small for a war of invasion. The two attempts at invasion that were made (in Austria and later in Prussia) ended in failure. Wars might go on without any decisive result until, having exhausted the money at their disposal, the governments decided to open negotiations for peace.

Diplomacy, which controlled the relations between states in time of peace, was still carried on by the methods established during the seventeenth century and in a Machiavellian spirit. It was very active during the eighteenth century, which was an age fertile in negotiations and treaties between governments, though the results did not amount to much. The delimitation of territory had been the work of treaties which had divided up the Spanish succession and afterwards taken from Sweden the Baltic territories conquered by the Russian Empire, and there was little change during the century. England, having checked Louis XIV, adopted as the aim of her foreign policy the maintenance of a balance among the great powers. The intrigues of the Queen of Spain to obtain a provision for her two sons disturbed part of Europe for a time, but ended in allotting them a kingdom and a principality in Italy. On this occasion diplomatists adopted the practice of transferring a prince from one country to another without consulting the inhabitants.

The two new kings of Prussia and Sardinia, who possessed small territories but large armies, were working towards their aggrandizement. The King of Prussia achieved his aim by taking advantage of the rupture between the great powers over the Austrian succession. The result was two wars between 1740 and 1763, each lasting for seven years, in which all states possessing armies took part. After these wars the only important operation, which was the work of diplomacy, was the partition of Poland between the three neighbouring powers, which was carried out on the principle of "compensations," any power which enlarged its territories at the expense of a weak state

recognizing the right of the others to compensate themselves for this aggrandizement by equivalent acquisitions.

Production

It was still agriculture that provided the bulk of the population with a livelihood, and in all countries its processes were still fixed by custom, by the rules governing the rotation of crops, and the poverty and ignorance of the peasants. Progress had only been possible in the Netherlands, where a rich and numerous urban population provided a safe market and good prices and where freedom of cultivation made it possible to use new methods of tillage and stock-breeding. The Dutch had invented intensive modern agriculture by planting forage crops in alternation with the usual sequence, and by the selection of stock for breeding (see Chapter XIV), which produced an unprecedented increase in the yield of crops and the quantity of meat and dairy produce. In the eighteenth century England landowners imitated them, especially in the east and south, by each obtaining a special act of Parliament empowering them to enclose their lands. This proceeding, adopted in the sixteenth century for the purpose of transforming meadows into pastures for sheep, was now employed for the cultivation of forage crops. This new method later found its way into the most fertile regions of northern France. The chief innovation was the spread of the cultivation of potatoes, which had been known since the sixteenth century, but only came into use slowly, first in England, then in Germany, and later in France.

Industrial labour continued to follow three methods. The oldest of these, which still provided employment for the bulk of the workers in almost every country and in most industries, was that by which the craftsman worked on his own account for local customers. Accustomed to the ancient processes of his craft, learned during a long apprenticeship, he did not change either his tools or his technique.

The contract system consisted in giving out the work to workmen hired for a wage. Since the contractor invested his money for a long period and worked for an unlimited number of customers, he had to make decisions with a view to an uncertain future and was led to speculate. This method became more widespread during the eighteenth century, especially in England, where the contractors employed workmen living outside the towns. The regulations were binding upon

the whole kingdom, but the justices of the peace whose duty it was to see that they were observed were landowners indifferent to industry, and, what is more, had no means of enforcing their application. This system was applied to the luxury industries which had to follow the fashion: fine woollen or linen cloth, silks, laces, ribbons, carpets, jewelry, watches, carriages, perfumery, as well as iron-founding, which used wood for heating and gave employment to woodmen, carters, and charcoal-burners.

The latest method consisted in employing workmen in one establishment under the supervision of foremen, but was hardly ever used except in industries working with machines fixed to the spot, and the workmen disliked it. During the eighteenth century it was extended to new industries: sugar-refining, the distillation of spirits, the manufacture of soap, candles, sulphuric acid, porcelain, and gunpowder, the making of uniforms, and later cotton-printing.

During the last thirty years of the century technical methods in England began to undergo a change, which is sometimes called the "industrial revolution." As a matter of fact, this was a process of evolution which extended over half a century and whose effects were not felt in Europe till the nineteenth century. It was the result of a number of inventions, having no connection with science, but made by men with an experience of mechanics or a taste for it: Watt's steam-engine, used to pump water out of mines, the spinning-machine, invented for supplying more rapidly yarn for weaving, and later power-loom for weaving. The new machines, worked, like mills, by wheels turned by a stream of water, made it necessary to concentrate workmen in large establishments. The same result was produced by the invention of the process for making coke from coal, which was used for iron-founding. This technical progress, which made it possible to manufacture goods in larger quantities and more cheaply, gave industry a new purpose. Till now it had served chiefly to provide luxury goods for the privileged classes, the nobles, prelates, and rich bourgeois, who alone were in a position to pay for them. It now began to produce goods which, though not so fine, were cheaper and hence accessible to a larger proportion of the population. It worked to an increasing extent for the consumption of the masses, who paid less but bought in larger quantities.

Trade and credit

For various reasons trade largely increased in volume. Currency was growing more plentiful, especially gold from Brazil and Guinea, which was used for coining the English pound. Prices were rising slowly, especially those of industrial products, while the price of wheat, which still depended upon each country's crop, was subject to abrupt variations, the difference being sometimes as much as one to ten. After the middle of the century internal trade was stimulated by the making of roads, which was carried out in France by the department of "bridges and roads (*ponts et chaussées*)," and in England at the expense of individuals who recouped themselves by levying tolls at the turnpikes. It also benefited from the progress in posting-arrangements, the organization of which was now complete in almost every state in Europe and which provided horses and carriages for travellers and carried letters, the charge for which was paid on delivery.

Almost all foreign trade was still carried on by sea in sailing-ships, which as a rule carried only goods, whence the name *packet-boat*. Their size was increasing, but was still limited, for harbours were not very deep and had no jetties, and the entrance channels were not clearly marked. The increased trade was chiefly with lands outside Europe: in the East with the East Indies, the Malay Archipelago, and China, and in the West with America, especially the West Indies. It dealt chiefly in natural products known as "colonial produce": cane-sugar and molasses used in the manufacture of rum; coffee, which was introduced into Java from Arabia and from thence into the West Indies and Brazil and came into general use in Europe during the eighteenth century; tobacco, which came into fashion in Holland for pipe-smoking, and elsewhere in the form of snuff; cocoa from America, used in the manufacture of chocolate, the use of which began in Spain. The trade in Negro slaves, purchased from native chiefs in Africa by the owners of vessels sent there for the purpose, and sold in America, yielded a profit estimated at fifty per cent even after the African purchase price had risen, and made the fortune of Liverpool and Nantes.

Home trade was still subject to restrictions arising out of custom. It was still regarded as immoral for a tradesman to try to attract

customers and enter into competition with a fellow-tradesman. It was in England that wholesale merchants broke with tradition by distributing "bills of advertisement," displaying goods for sale in their windows or show-cases, and sending out travellers with samples to offer their wares as far afield as Germany. They also started inserting commercial advertisements in the newspapers, for which these became the chief source of profit. A contemporary said in 1766: "A few years ago this would have been considered unworthy of respectable people."

Trade with distant countries, which required the tying up of a large capital, had been organized during the seventeenth century by State-aided companies, and this method was adopted by the German princes in the eighteenth century. The type of company founded in England under the name of joint-stock company, the origin of the limited-liability company, was discredited there by the famous failure of the South Sea Company and in France by the failure of the company founded by the Scotchman Law on the English model. This unpopularity lasted till the end of the century. Those who had money to invest preferred to buy land or lend it to merchants who made themselves personally responsible for it.

Credit became more mobile during the eighteenth century in those countries in which capital had accumulated as the result of trade on a large scale — in Holland, England, Basel, and Geneva, all of them Protestant places with a free political system. Credit transactions, deposits, transfers, loans at interest, and the discounting of commercial bills were carried on by private banks issuing bank-notes, even in England, where the Bank of England had been granted the right to issue notes of corresponding values payable at sight. The failure of Law's Bank made this procedure unpopular in France, and in 1755 nothing could be ventured upon beyond the foundation of a *comptoir d'escompte* (discount bank) having no right to issue notes. In other countries banks confined themselves to receiving and paying deposits and did little discount business, for merchants were afraid of injuring their credit by having their bills discounted. Securities were henceforth negotiated on the exchanges of a few great cities by *brokers*, who dealt in the shares of great companies, and in the interest-bearing loans issued by states and cities. Great states were ceasing to secure their loans upon some particular part of their revenue, which was

pledged to their creditors, but issued loans under the general guarantee of the State in the form of a perpetual annuity or life-annuity in the name of the lender.

Governments continued to intervene in the processes of economic life. During the eighteenth century they almost always applied the methods of the mercantilist school, which based the power of the State on money, acquired chiefly through foreign trade. They tried to arrive at a favourable "balance of trade" by the same means as in the seventeenth century, such as very high customs duties or the prohibition of foreign goods and vessels, subsidies to luxury industries, and the foundation of State-aided manufactories. This system was copied from the western countries by the sovereigns of the less economically advanced states of central and eastern Europe. The English Government tried to apply it to its colonies and came into conflict with its English colonists in America on the subject of customs duties and the prohibition of industries, which ended in revolt.

Society

The figures of the European population in the eighteenth century are not known to us from a trustworthy census in any country. It had certainly increased, especially in the almost depopulated lands of eastern Europe and in England, where the density seems to have risen from 90 to 165 inhabitants per square mile, as the result of the new labouring population which grew up in the very sparsely populated regions of the north and west owing to the establishment of industries in the neighbourhood of coal and iron mines and near waterfalls. France still had the greatest number of inhabitants and towns with a population of over ten thousand.

The social structure varied little during the century. Social life in every country was ordered according to an almost immutable organization of the family, property, and authority, and even absolute governments did not venture to upset it, so much as by taxation. Every man's place was determined by his relation to the authorities, his wealth and profession, and the result was a division into classes which was still officially recognized in every land.

The mass of the population, consisting of manual labourers, was still the lower class in all countries, dependent, with a poor standard of living, and excluded from all public life or social gatherings.

Throughout the whole of western and central Europe, and to an increasing extent the farther west they lived, the peasants were obtaining freedom before the law, being relieved of personal service to their lord and enjoying the right to leave the land. In almost every land most of the country population consisted of peasant proprietors, each family cultivating a separate piece of land and living on what it produced. A large proportion of the best lands belonged to the nobles and clergy and, in an increasing degree, to the bourgeoisie, who in rich countries, where there was no scarcity of money, let them on short leases to the peasants, but more often on the *métayage* system, in which rents were paid in kind.

The greatest change which took place in the course of the century was in England. The yeomen, who had been fairly numerous in the more densely populated parts of the country, the east and south, almost entirely disappeared, attracted, perhaps, to the towns, where they set up industrial enterprises. Gentlemen bought their lands, got rid of the tenants with short leases, and threw the whole into a great estate, which they farmed themselves or leased to *farmers*. The work was done by day-labourers; no peasants, in the European sense of the word, survived.

There were then three different regions in Europe with great domains cultivated by hired labourers: in England, on the estates of gentlemen or of the clergy, the *day-labourers*, living in a *cottage* belonging to the landlord, and receiving a wage, fixed by rule, which had become insufficient for a family's requirements and was supplemented by an allowance in the form of poor-relief, the expense of which was borne by the taxpayers of the parish; in the southern lands (south and central Spain, southern Italy, and Lombardy) the great landowners had their domains cultivated by free labourers, living wretchedly in villages or small towns on a very meagre wage; in the vast regions of eastern Europe, Prussia, the Baltic Provinces, Hungary, Poland, and even Bohemia, most of the peasants were still "subjects" (German *Hörige*), attached to the domain. Even the more favourably situated of them were tenants loaded with heavy dues and many days of forced labour (in Slav, *robot*); most of them were mere day-labourers receiving a very small wage and usually a cottage and piece of land.

In the Russian Empire the position of the peasants had been revo-

lutionized at the sovereign's behest, except in the forest region of the far north and the Cossack lands in the extreme south, where they were still free. For purposes of the poll-tax Peter the Great had had a register of all the inhabitants of the country districts drawn up, including beggars, freedmen, and slaves, in which all differences of status had been done away with, so that all the peasants were abandoned to the arbitrary power of the owner of the village, assimilated to a noble. Later the Government recognized the nobleman's right to have a peasant sent to Siberia for theft, drunkenness, or "unseemly or insolent actions," and in 1767 the peasant was forbidden to lay a complaint against his master before the courts. It did not officially recognize the nobleman's right to take a peasant off the land and sell him, but in practice sales were already taking place, and the master was coming more and more to use the people on his domain for his own personal service and surround himself with a band of servants who had no protection against his caprices. The Russian peasant was living on a level at which he was assimilated to the serfs of Europe, and was, in point of fact beginning to become a slave.

Industrial workers were increasingly divided into two categories by the new technical methods. In almost the whole of Europe craftsmen still formed the large majority. The Russian Government had grouped them in guilds on the European model. But in the countries where industry was organized on the contract system (England, the Netherlands, and northern France), the number of hired labourers working either at home or in large factories rapidly increased. Their position was deteriorating, for their wages were still fixed by custom or were subject to a legal maximum, whereas the price of necessities was rising, so that many of them could no longer exist except by the aid of charity or poor-relief.

The Government supported the employers by keeping in force the measures against journeymen; it forbade workmen to form associations or even concert measures for discussing matters with their master, and treated a strike as a revolt. The Government tried to keep wages low, so as to compel the workmen to work all the week. It was as the result of observing the practice of his own day that the French philanthropist Turgot formulated "the iron law of wages (*la loi d'airain du salaire*)," which was that wages normally fall to the subsistence level. In England, where the new machine made it possible

to learn the work quickly, the masters employed, under the name of apprentices, numbers of workmen far in excess of the legal allowance who had served no apprenticeship. They hired five-year-old children of indigent families in receipt of relief and paid them no wages.

Above the mass of manual labourers there was a growing class of people living in the towns on a profession requiring only a very small capital and an elementary education, but excluded from society by its manners and mode of life. These were the shopkeepers, commercial employees, and the lower grades of official.

The most important change in this century was the rise of the middle class, which in France still bore the name of bourgeoisie. In Protestant countries it was now swelled by the ministers of religion, who were no longer set apart from lay society by celibacy or by their costume, and whose education brought them nearer to the "liberal professions." The Catholic parish priests, and even the regular clergy in the towns, were still compelled to lead a very different kind of life, but were also raised by their profession to the level of the bourgeoisie. This middle class came to be increasingly distinguished from the people by its comfortable life and its costume, speech, and manners and was constantly drawing closer to the nobility, from which it was now differentiated by hardly anything but legal privileges. Those land-owners who lived an idle life on the income from their estates were becoming indistinguishable from the nobility as the result of their mode of life. In England they had long been assimilated to gentlemen by birth. This class was less numerous in Germany and more sharply distinguished from the nobility. In eastern Europe it was still non-existent.

In all countries except England the nobility continued officially to be the upper class, still in enjoyment of its privileges, especially as regards taxation. By virtue of their original character as fighting men (of which nothing remained in England), the nobles still had greater facilities for obtaining officers' commissions, and were accustomed, if not obliged, to practice no gainful profession, which prevented them from increasing their wealth, and often even from keeping it. In eastern Europe, especially in Poland and Hungary, where the levy in mass still existed in theory, the nobles, in the absence of any middle class, enjoyed a far more marked superiority and still maintained their air of command. In Russia the Tsar had conferred

the title of nobles upon the possessors of domains from whom some public service other than that of serving in war was due. When compulsory service was abolished in 1762, they became country gentlemen, living a life of leisure.

Throughout the whole of Europe the nobility was coming to be recruited more and more among the bourgeoisie, who alone enjoyed the means of acquiring wealth. By acquiring an estate, purchasing an office, and obtaining the grant of a patent of nobility they became gentlemen and assumed the style of esquire. Since the nobles no longer engaged in their original profession of war and did not practise any other, they spent their lives without working.

Natural religion

The most profound change that took place during this period was that affecting the beliefs by which conduct is determined. The Christian conception of the relations between God and man, which had received a shock as early as the seventeenth century, was entirely upset by a new belief which was the work of English theologians and was known by the end of the seventeenth century as "natural religion." Orthodox doctrine represented God as a severe judge ready to condemn man, whose nature impelled him towards evil. The new belief, on the contrary, imagined Him as a tender and benevolent Father who loves man, His own creature, and desires to see him happy. Far from being evil and subject to Satan, nature is the work of a good God, and, like Him, it too is good. God has endowed man with reason for his guidance, and reason, which is a part of nature, commands him to follow the natural tendency prompting him to seek his own happiness and that of others.

The originators of this doctrine had had no idea of ousting Christianity, but desired to strengthen it by making it "reasonable." In point of fact, they were destroying the dualism on which it was based, by denying the existence of the Devil, demons, and the eternal punishment of hell, and maintaining the optimistic idea that human nature is good; by taking the quest of happiness as the object of life, they were destroying asceticism; and by no longer recognizing the divinity of Jesus, they were destroying the Trinity and the Incarnation. They deprived Christianity of its supernatural character by rejecting revelation, mysteries, and miracles as contrary to the immutable laws estab-

lished by God. In the name of reason "natural religion" did away with all those Christian beliefs which had come from the East, and retained only the ideas of the Greek philosophers, the disciples of Socrates: the existence of a divine Providence, which was necessary to explain the harmony of the universe, the immortality of the soul, regarded as necessary for the maintenance of morality. It provided a new guide for conduct: instead of spending the present life in struggling against his nature so as to secure salvation in the future life, man need only follow his nature to pursue happiness in the present life. The English who adopted this conception felt themselves liberated from beliefs contrary to reason and took the name of *deists* or *free-thinkers*.

These ideas, condemned by the clergy and the secular authorities in all Catholic countries, could only appear freely and openly in lands accustomed to toleration. They were brought from England by Voltaire and Montesquieu, the French *philosophes*, together with the idea of political liberty, which had been realized under the limited monarchy; thence, too, came the names of *natural religion*, *deism*, and *free thought*, and the Freemasons' *lodges*, established under the form of a craft guild. In Germany these ideas were known collectively by the term *Aufklärung*. The fundamental rule of conduct — obedience to tradition and authority — was replaced by individual judgment, known as "free inquiry (*examen*).” This led directly to a criticism of the dogmas of the Church and was afterwards to prepare the way for criticism of the authority of the Government and for political liberty.

These new ideas did not permeate the mass of the people, attached to tradition and under the supervision of authority; even the bourgeois and the lesser nobility preserved their former practices and beliefs. In France the eighteenth century was an age of religious fervour; in England it was the age of the Methodist "revival," a protest against the lukewarmness of the higher clergy; in Germany that of the Pietist movement.

Natural religion affected only a very small minority of great lords, courtiers, princes and ministers, writers and men of learning, but these were the men who controlled governments and influenced public opinion. The English aristocracy made natural religion the fashion in the high society of Europe. It was disseminated by the Freemasons'

lodges, which found their members among nobles and officers. In Germany it spread to princes and men of letters, and it was carried by German sovereigns to the great nobles of Russia.

The new conception of religion found greater difficulty in making its way in the Catholic states, where the clergy preserved their power of restraint and kept a watch over the faithful. In Spain and Portugal it was checked by the Inquisition. In France it was combated by the courts of law, which ordered the writings of the *philosophes* to be burned. It could not be expounded in public, but it made its way through secret agencies, especially in France: through private conversations in the *cafés* and in the drawing-rooms of certain ladies where great people met men of letters; and later through the Free-masons' lodges and *clubs* founded on the English model. It also spread by means of books and pamphlets which, though prohibited, were smuggled into the country from abroad or secretly printed.

In France especially the criticism of belief itself was carried to the lengths of *materialism*, which denied the existence of the soul, and *atheism*, which denied the existence of God. But this extreme view was only professed in a very narrow circle of learned and literary men. High society did not go beyond natural religion, which became a mark of breeding. It was considered good form to despise the practices of the Christian religion.

Effects of natural religion

As early as the middle of the century the conception of nature as good, since it was the work of a kindly God, was applied to economic life. The "economists" based their theories on the principle that Providence has ordered nature with a view to the happiness of man; they called it *physiocracy* (the rule of nature), and demanded that governments should allow free play to the "laws of nature" established by Providence, by abolishing all regulations hampering the free play of natural economic laws. They came forward as the opponents of all the practices of the mercantilist school and demanded complete freedom of agriculture, industry, and trade, not in the name of any human right to liberty, for they proclaimed themselves the partisans of absolute government and admired the despotism of China, but to restore the order willed by the Deity.

The excellence of human nature was also invoked by Rousseau, a

deist, when he condemned inequality in the conditions of life and even rejected monarchy, proposing a republic as his ideal. The same feeling showed itself in that admiration for nature which had become the fashion in England. During the last thirty years of the century it inspired an enthusiasm for "sensibility," which was expressed on the one hand in outpourings of tender love and friendship and on the other hand in allowing free course to sensuality.

By identifying goodness with happiness, natural religion led men to think that a God who was essentially good commanded men to seek not only their own happiness, but also that of others. For Christian charity, which in practice was confined to giving alms, it substituted the practice of beneficence (*bienfaisance*) or "doing good" to those who stood in need of it. This took the practical form of institutions intended to ameliorate the lot of unfortunates of all kinds: hospitals, almshouses, homes for cripples, the blind and deaf-mutes, orphanages, and homes for foundlings.

This kind of charity was not confined within the limits of a state. Like Christian charity, it extended to all mankind, as God's creatures, and came in the end to embrace the whole of the human race. It transformed into a sentiment hitherto very rare in Europe: humanitarianism, strengthened by natural feelings of compassion for the sufferings of others. It prepared the way for a deep-seated revolution in manners, a horror of cruel penalties, corporal punishment, or harshness to inferiors.

Confidence in the reason granted by God to man now inspired a desire to order not only religion and morality, but also government and society, according to the ideas suggested by reason. The whole of the existing system in Europe, which had grown out of custom, now seemed a mass of errors and injustices; customs and institutions were regarded as *abuses* contrary to nature and justice. Accordingly, reason commanded that the whole of this "old system (*ancien régime*)," based upon tradition and authority, should be rejected, and a system based on reason and liberty substituted for it. All these ideas (nature, reason, humanity) were universal terms of equal application to all peoples, and hence arose the "cosmopolitan" character of thought in the eighteenth century. The religion of nature and reason inspired in those initiated into it a sense of pride at feeling themselves freed from the errors of the past and living by the light of truth, in the

hope of seeing human life so much changed as to achieve happiness in conformity with the designs of Providence. Beneath its rational form this optimistic sentiment was religious in character and inspired people with a contempt for the past and an enthusiastic confidence in the future, out of which was to arise the fervour of the French Revolution.

Science, literature, and the arts

Progress in science went on chiefly in the northern lands, thanks to the efforts of isolated men of learning, and by the aid of certain inventions: the thermometer, the electrical machine, and optical instruments. The science of physics was taking shape through the separate study of every type of phenomenon: weight, sound, light, heat, electricity. Chemistry, held back by an erroneous theory, began to take shape towards the end of this period through the analysis of gases by Priestley and, above all, Lavoisier. The natural sciences, which were constituted by reducing past observations to a system, also took form: botany thanks to the Swede Linnæus, zoology thanks to Buffon, whose generalized theories also prepared the way for geology and anthropology.

The literature of the eighteenth century presents this exceptional feature: that all its original works are in prose: Swift and the English novelists, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Diderot. These took the form of novels, political treatises, satirical works, and letters, most of them inspired by the new ideas and opposed to tradition. Towards the end of this period a return to poetry of a lyrical nature was beginning in Germany.

The plastic arts, which produced hardly any original works except in France and England, yielded chiefly paintings characterized by grace of style. The masterpieces in this province were perhaps to be found in the decorative arts and furniture.

In musical mastery Germany was taking the place of Italy, thanks to the masterpieces of instrumental music produced by Bach, Handel, Haydn, and Mozart, and opera was being renewed by Germans: Gluck and afterwards Mozart.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE WAR OF INVASIONS

•

The crisis leading up to it

The quarter of a century between 1759 and 1814 was full of revolutions and wars which caused an upheaval in the life of all Europe. Political and social conditions made a revolution very difficult. The governments had at their disposal standing armies and a body of officials and were supported by a clergy with powers of exerting pressure and an aristocracy of great landowners. The privileged classes enjoyed all the advantages of life — power, wealth, consideration, and education. The mass of the people remained poor, dependent, ignorant, and excluded from all public life. To do away with a system of government upheld both by the ruling classes, possessed of armed force, and by the privileged classes, which were interested in its maintenance, a material force was necessary; and the people had none at their disposal save that of disorders in the capital. No revolution had been a success in Europe except those in the United Provinces and England, which had started with a religious revolt.

The Revolution began in France as the result of abnormal conditions. Not that material life had become unbearable for the people, or that oppression by the Government or exploitation by the privileged classes had become harsher. The difference lay in the fact that practices which had hitherto been endured with resignation, as being inevitable, were resented as abuses which could be abolished. The cult of reason and humanity, based upon natural religion, inspired men of enlightenment with a desire to put an end to the “old regime,” with its despotism, intolerance, and inequality, by doing away with abso-

lute power, religious compulsion, and legal privileges. This desire for radical reform did not come from the people, but originated with the cultivated men of a generation imbued with an optimistic confidence in the goodness of human nature and devoid of all political experience. They imagined that the system by which a people is ruled can be changed by the goodwill and virtues of its rulers, and that all that was needed was to abolish absolute power and privileges, at the same time establishing liberty and allowing all men access to employment. They summed up their desires in the formula, dating from before 1789, of *Liberty and Equality*, and gave the name *Revolution*, in use as early as the middle of the eighteenth century, to the longed-for change in the system of government.

The desire for this revolution was encouraged by models which had found practical realization: the limited monarchy and religious toleration in England, as described by the *philosophes*; and still more by the system of government recently set up by the English colonists in America; for in carrying out their own revolution they had expressly appealed to natural religion. The American *Declaration of Independence* demanded on behalf of every people the right "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them"; it proclaimed "these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the *pursuit of Happiness*." The Declaration of Rights prefixed to the new Constitution of Virginia, not by proletarians anxious for the amelioration of their material conditions of life, but by owners of large estates and slaves, said that: "All men are by nature free and equal," and among the "inherent rights" of man it cited "the means of seeking and obtaining happiness."

The spread of these sentiments was assisted by exceptional conditions. There were in France a large number of small towns in which the leading class consisted of bourgeois with moderate means, and especially lawyers, most of whom owned some land, had independent means, and enjoyed ample leisure; many of them read the works of the *philosophes* and were full of confidence in reason. They were humiliated by the nobility of the sword, and even of the robe, who made them conscious of class disparities. In the country districts the

parish priests were dissatisfied with the extreme inequality between their stipends and those of the higher clergy. The peasants who were the hereditary owners of their land were angered by the "feudal dues," which caused them far more loss than they brought profit to their lord.

But the malcontents had scarcely any means of showing their discontent, for there was no body having power to resist the ministers. It was the Government itself that provided its impotent subjects with the instrument for carrying out the Revolution. It had met its expenditure by loans, thus creating a growing deficit. When it tried to raise money by extending direct taxation to include the privileged classes, it came into acute conflict with the privileged nobles. Both these opposing elements were interested in the maintenance of the established order, but each was interested in maintaining a different part of it: the Government laid the stress on its absolute power, the privileged classes on the inequalities in taxation. Each was trying to do away with the parts embarrassing to itself, the Government wanting to abolish privilege in the matter of taxation, and the privileged orders to abolish absolute power.

Being short of money, the Government at last summoned the assembly of the States General, which had fallen into desuetude since 1614. But it was elected on a very different system from the traditional one, by local assemblies, the large majority in which was composed of delegates representing two kinds of subjects who had never been represented before: in the assemblies of the clergy, the parish priests, and in the assemblies of the Third Estate, the peasants. Thus a mass of men hitherto always excluded from public life now entered it. The Assembly of the States General elected in these conditions met at Versailles, but the King retained the power of suspending or dissolving it.

The monarchical Revolution

The French Revolution was the work of two revolutions. The first, in 1789, abolished the *ancien régime*, while retaining the monarchy. It was carried out by a series of "revolutionary days (*journées*)," some of which were the work of the Assembly, the others of the people in the working-class quarters of Paris (*faubourgs*). First, there was the Oath of the Tennis Court, by which the deputies of the bourgeoisie,

who had illegally constituted themselves an "assembly of the nation," swore not to separate until the Constitution had been framed. Secondly, there was the taking of the Bastille by the people of the neighbouring *faubourg*. Thirdly, there was the night of August 4, on which the Assembly proclaimed the abolition of all privileges. Fourthly, there were the days of October 5 and 6, when a mob went to Versailles to fetch the King and brought him back to Paris, where he remained under the eye of the people. These events were accompanied by acts of violence perpetrated against the privileged classes, who were called *aristocrats*. Throughout the whole of France *clubs* were formed on the model of the English-speaking lands for the discussion of political questions, and *committees* which kept a watch over those opposed to the Revolution.

The Assembly voted a "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen," based upon natural law and following the American example, and next a written Constitution, which established the "separation of powers" on the American model. It rejected the English practice of choosing the ministers from Parliament. It left the king "the executive power," but limited this to the power of appointing ministers and those in charge of the army and foreign affairs, and gave him the right of suspending the decisions of the legislative assembly, known, as in the United States, as the *veto*.

It established a uniform system of divisions into departments, districts, cantons, and communes, which was applied to its whole territory, with no distinction between town and country, and also applied it to justice, finance, administration, and even religious worship. It established a uniform system of direct taxation (known as *contributions*), equal and proportionate to means. As in the United States, those exercising public functions were elected by the inhabitants of the region in which they had to exercise them. The result was a system of elective local autonomy, which meant that every region was governed by its inhabitants, or, in point of fact, by the leading bourgeois of those parts.

The Assembly desired to abolish provincial differences arising out of tradition and give the whole nation a common system of government based upon rational principles, while leaving the population of each region to apply it. This sentiment found expression in 1790 in the *federation* of the National Guards. Henceforward the unity of the

Various types of resistance

French nation was to rest not upon obedience to the same king, but upon the sense of belonging to the same nation. Its symbols were the tricolour flag and the use of the word *national*. The word *patriot* acquired a new signification, being applied to the partisans of the new order, as contrasted with *aristocrats*, who were the partisans of the old order.

The Assembly, being attached to the Catholic religion, regarded the clergy as a body exercising a public function, and desired to reorganize it in the same way as other functions by adapting the diocese to the department and making bishops and priests elective. To meet the deficit, it decided to "place at the disposal of the nation" all property in possession of the bishoprics, parishes, and convents. These it converted into "national property," which was put up for sale, and *assignats* were issued, secured upon this property.

Various types of resistance

The National Assembly had intended to carry out a peaceful revolution, but the abrupt abolition of all institutions and rights based upon custom caused indignation and anger first among the nobles, who began to emigrate as early as 1789, and next among most of the bishops and priests. Those who refused to take the oath to the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy," which was condemned by the Pope, were deprived of their office for being *refractory*, but were supported by the faithful, especially in the north and west. This conflict cut the mass of the French people in two and turned most of the peasants and almost all the women against the Revolution.

As regards its relations with foreign peoples, the Assembly proclaimed its attachment to peace and decreed that "the French nation renounces all war with a view to conquest." Yet the Revolution perturbed foreign sovereigns, the clergy, and aristocrats, by setting their subjects the dangerous example of overthrowing an established government in the name of a natural right common to all men, and had also become suspect as the result of its disorders and acts of violence. Louis XVI, now the prisoner of the people of Paris, had asked the other sovereigns for assistance, and the nobles who had emigrated to the countries bordering upon France were threatening to return in arms.

Louis XVI fled from Paris in the direction of the *émigrés*, and,

when brought back by force, remained under the suspicion of being involved with foreign powers. Though the great majority in the new Assembly elected in 1791 was attached to the monarchy, it came into conflict with the King by decreeing measures against the *émigrés* and refractory priests, which Louis XVI refused to accept. In agreement with the King's ministers it allowed itself to be led into declaring war on the German princes and the Emperor. A coalition of sovereigns was formed against France. The French army, disorganized by the departure of most of the officers, who had emigrated, broke up, and foreign armies invaded France and marched on Paris.

The republican Revolution

The invasion precipitated a crisis, the outcome of which was a second Revolution. This was the work of a small minority intent upon doing away with the king, and was carried out by violent action on the part of the insurgents against the legal authorities: first against the Paris Commune, then against the King, and finally against the Assembly. It was completed by the summary execution of the suspects under arrest in the prisons and the meeting of a *Convention*, charged with drawing up a new Constitution and governing pending its promulgation. The Convention proclaimed a Republic, as resulting from the abolition of the royal power. But before it had had time to establish the new system of government, it was led on to upset the relations between France and other states.

The Prussian army had fallen back, and the French armies were occupying the countries adjacent to France: Savoy, the left bank of the Rhine, and later Belgium. The generals made changes in those administrative bodies which were hostile to France and allowed revolutionary propaganda to be carried on. The Convention now proclaimed that it "granted fraternity and aid to all peoples desirous of regaining their liberty," and ordered the generals to "defend citizens subjected to vexation in the cause of liberty," and later to abolish tithes and feudal dues and obtain the election of temporary administrators who should "swear fidelity to liberty and equality." This was an incitement to subjects to revolt against their governments and meant imposing the new French principles and practices as a rule for other peoples.

The anger roused by this propaganda was exasperated by the exe-

cution of the King, which other sovereigns felt as a challenge, and they entered into a general coalition against the Republic. The Convention, obliged to protect the weak minority in the occupied countries consisting of partisans of the Revolution, was led, at their request, to annex their countries to the Republic, in spite of the promise made in 1790.

The invasion of France in 1793 by the armies of the Coalition states upset her internal politics. At first the Government had been under the control of the representatives of the departments, bourgeois notables supported by the great majority of the Convention against the small group, known as the *Mountain*, consisting of representatives of Paris and supported only by the poorest portion of the Parisian people. It was discredited by the defeat of the armies, whose general went over to the enemy, whereupon the Mountain seized power by a fresh act of violence on the part of the inhabitants of the working-class *faubourgs* against the Paris Commune and the Convention.

The new masters of power, desirous of adopting more vigorous measures for prosecuting the war and putting down its adversaries at home, centralized the authority so as to make it stronger. The central Government was given to a "Committee of Public Safety" elected by the Convention, which controlled the Government and made its orders obeyed by sending out "representatives on mission," armed with full powers, to the generals and departments. This system of government was officially known as *revolutionary government*, because it was contrary to the principle of the separation of powers and had been set up as a provisional expedient for the war only, till the coming of peace. Throughout a large part of France it provoked armed revolts by the partisans of the old regime and those in favour of local autonomy. The Government crushed this resistance by means of the *Terror* (the term officially used), under which suspects were tried before a "revolutionary tribunal."

In order to appease the mass of the people, angered by the rise in the prices of food, the Government fixed a *maximum* price for the necessities of life, decreed the forced circulation of the assignats, which became a paper currency, and ordered the requisitioning of all things necessary for the war. This was not a new system of social economy having as its purpose a change in the organization of society, but a temporary measure for the duration of the war.

Changes in the army

The local agents charged with collecting the taxes had, in practice, no powers of enforcing payment, and the Government was in great need of money. Hence the normal revenue was very meagre. The treasury being empty, the Government was led to issue increasing quantities of assignats, the value of which continued to fall. In the regions occupied by the armies it levied taxes and made enormous requisitions, accompanied by measures of repression which made the inhabitants hostile to the Revolution and to France.

Changes in the army

The army, composed in theory of volunteers, was no longer adequate for carrying on a war against the Coalition states. In 1793 the Government adopted a new procedure for recruiting: it ordered the requisitioning of 300,000 men, to be distributed among the communes, the recruits being usually chosen by lot. The principle of compulsory service was established, and regularized in 1798 by conscription, which was applied to all bachelors between twenty and twenty-five. Almost all the officers had emigrated, and their place was taken by non-commissioned officers, some of whom rose very rapidly and became generals.

The upheaval in the army was even more profound than that of society. The army contained far more recruits doing compulsory service than volunteers. The corps of officers, hitherto reserved to nobles or rich men, became filled with men of the people, accustomed to a very hard life. The armies of the other states, consisting of professional soldiers and, by reason of their costliness, not very large, were under the command of officers accustomed to a comfortable life, who carried baggage about with them, and of old and prudent generals, who insisted upon maintaining their communications with the magazines necessary for the upkeep of the troops. They manœuvred slowly over a limited area. The French armies, disposing of an unlimited number of men, had the superiority in numbers. They were not hampered by impedimenta, the officers had no baggage, the soldiers could spend their nights bivouacking in front of a fire and lived on the country by requisitions. They improvised a type of combat contrary to the rules by deploying in loose order as skirmishers. The armies advanced rapidly under the command of young and enterprising generals. Having cleared French territory of the enemy,

The Revolution in Europe

they began a war of invasion, penetrating into the heart of the enemy's country in order to force him to sue for peace.

The final crisis of the Revolution

The Convention, weakened by violent conflicts which had ended in the execution of its most active members, abandoned the Constitution voted in 1793 and made a new one, giving the executive power to a Directory of five members, and created a Legislative Body with two assemblies. It made use of the army to defend itself against insurrections of the Parisian populace and royalists. Later, when the elections had filled the assemblies with a majority suspected of desiring to restore the king, the Government of the Directory made use of the army to rid itself of its adversaries.

The Revolution had produced results very different from what its authors had intended. They had succeeded in creating a uniform system for public life, completed in 1793 by a uniform system of weights and measures on the decimal system, and in establishing equality of rights and taxation. But they had desired to reform the monarchy and had established a republic; to restore the finances, and had ended in a deficit and bankruptcy; to reorganize the Church, and had overthrown it; to preserve the volunteer army, and had introduced compulsory service. They had wanted to give France local autonomy and political liberty, and had prepared the way for a centralized and authoritarian government. They had wanted to renounce war and conquest, and involved France in a general war followed by extensive conquests. They had wanted to set up a government which should be a model for other peoples, and had inspired them with an aversion for it.

The Revolution in Europe

The Revolution, hailed at first with sympathy by partisans of the new ideas in Europe, was soon discredited by its disorders and by the Terror. The absolute governments entered the war against France. Even in Great Britain, where there had at first been demonstrations of sympathy for a revolution founded upon liberty, the war against France consolidated the traditional system of government by the aristocracy. In Poland the patriots, anxious at the weakness of their country against the menace of neighbouring states, caused a Constitu-

tion to be voted in imitation of that of France. This served the governments of Russia and Prussia as a pretext for carrying out a second partition of Poland in 1793. The patriots responded by a rising which gave the three powers their chance of partitioning the rest of the country.

When the French armies occupied foreign countries, the French Government had hesitated as to what it ought to do with them. The party that carried the day revived the formula of "natural frontiers" (those of ancient Gaul) and annexed to France all territories as far as the Rhine and the Alps. When the armies, overstepping these frontiers, occupied the Netherlands in 1795, northern Italy in 1796, and afterwards Switzerland and southern Italy, all these lands were organized into six republics with a system of government copied from the French Republic. The government of these territories was handed over to the small minorities which rallied to the Revolution and abolished the old regime. But in order to raise the money necessary for its armies, the French Government seized the public funds, imposed enormous cash levies, especially in Italy, requisitioned goods, and confiscated the property of the clergy and of partisans of the old regime.

The new republics did not last, but there were certain survivals in Switzerland: the abolition of inequalities between one region and another and the establishment of equality between the cantons. In Italy the survivals included the tricolour flag, which became the symbol of Italian unity, and the annexation of the extensive territory of Venice to Austria. The project of landing a French army in Ireland to cause a rising of the adversaries of English domination was a failure, but determined the British Government to obtain the passage of the Act of Union in 1800, which did away with the Irish Parliament.

The centralized system in France

The political system set up in France by the Revolution was weakened by violent conflicts among the parties and changed as the result of a final act of force carried out by part of the Directory and one of the assemblies, with the assistance of a general, for the purpose of getting rid of elections. The result was a complete reorganization, with a partial restoration of the old regime. General Bonaparte succeeded in having the whole power of government (known as the "executive

power ") given to him alone. The "legislative power" was divided among four assemblies, recruited by expedients which did away with elections and offered ways of providing the members of the former assemblies with well-paid posts. This body of men, consisting of bourgeois, most of whom had been lawyers and were accustomed to practical affairs, were bent upon keeping the bourgeoisie in power. It was they who adopted or inspired measures and appointed the officials. Unlike the Constituent Assembly, which had entrusted the administration of every region to councils elected by the local people, the centralized Government took all power into its own hands and delegated it to a single agent in every administrative area — the prefect or the mayor (*maire*). All agents performing any special service were also officials, appointed and paid by the central Government. No elective public authorities survived, the people no longer had any share in the control of affairs, and citizens had once again become subjects. The French nation was far more strictly subordinated to a centralized system than under the monarchy, for public functions had then been exercised by those possessing their offices, who were almost independent, whereas in future they were performed by genuine agents dependent upon the Government, and most of them strangers to the district in which they worked.

Despite those with whom he was surrounded, Bonaparte desired to conciliate the Catholics by restoring the ancient Church and, following the methods of the monarchy, concluded a Concordat with the Pope. He revealed his motives in the remarks: "There must be a religion for the people," or: "Religion prevents the rich from being massacred by the people." He did not restore either the religious orders or the property of the clergy. The Concordat recognized the authority of the pope over the secular clergy, but the Government chose the bishops and *curés-doyens*; all other parish priests became mere Mass-priests (*desservants*), removable at the bishop's pleasure.

Once he felt his position consolidated, Bonaparte first caused the title of Consul for life to be bestowed upon him, and afterwards that of *Emperor* of the French. The restoration of the monarchy was completed by the creation of a court with a ceremonial copied from that of the ancient royal court. Napoleon also revived certain practices of the old regime: the commission of censorship and State prisons in which suspects were imprisoned without being brought to trial.

Napoleon's armies

The French army continued to be recruited and perform its operations according to the procedure improvised during the Revolution. It was composed of *conscripts* between twenty and twenty-five years of age who were bound to do military service, though substitutes (*remplaçants*) were accepted so as to spare the young bourgeois. The recruits did not live in barracks and received no training. The new ones learned how to manœuvre and use their arms through contact with their seniors. The soldiers had no regular drill, and discipline remained very easy. The officers, who had risen from the ranks, were not required to have any education and were not promoted by seniority. The infantry had flintlocks discharging four bullets every three minutes and with a range of over two hundred yards. The cavalry, for the most part light, was used for reconnaissances and charges.

There was still a shortage of money, and funds were supplied for the army by war levies raised in the enemy country. The generals had to "provide themselves with their means of subsistence in the land" which they were occupying, and the armies marched so rapidly that provisions could not have followed them. The soldiers were supposed to receive five sous a day and a bread ration; they were often starving and drenched with rain, and had little sleep and a great deal of marching. Losses from gunshot wounds were very small, owing to the inferior weapons of that day, but the army was ravaged by sickness — typhus, septicæmia, and gangrene among the wounded — and suffered very great losses through desertion and bands of looters.

This revolutionary army practised a new strategy. Napoleon had grasped a fact which professional soldiers had not clearly realized: that war is not an end in itself. It is merely a means of forcing the enemy to accept the policy which it is desired to impose upon him, by occupying his territory and destroying his armies. War as he waged it was neither siege-warfare nor a war of positions. His method was a rapid invasion, making use of surprise, so as to arrive at a decisive battle in which he would have the superiority in numbers. He kept his various corps of troops in touch with one another and manœuvred in such a way as to unite them against an enemy whose forces were still scattered. Hence his troops had to carry out very rapid marches, which were only possible with soldiers having great endurance and

Napoleon's domination in Europe

capable of long marches in all weathers. On the field of battle his tactics were still the same as those of the Revolutionary armies, battle being joined on the whole front at once by skirmishers, each man taking aim, continued by a column of attack, and ending in the flight of the enemy.

In a war which was bound to be short, for lack of money, everything was improvised — the instruction of the soldiers, equipment, provisioning, marching, and the action itself. This system, invented by Bonaparte as early as 1796 in Italy, a land of abundant resources, with a warm, dry climate, and within a limited area of operations, worked less and less well as it was applied successively in Germany, Prussia, and finally Russia, in vast, almost unpopulated areas, producing no food and having a very cold climate, where distances were too great for the marches of an army eager to join battle, and melting away on the road. It was also very ill-suited to Spain, for guerrilla warfare without a decisive engagement, and in a poor country where the troops had to be maintained at the expense of France.

Napoleon's domination in Europe

After reconquering Italy and making peace with all the states, Bonaparte changed the system of government in the republics by concentrating all power in the hands of a president and reorganizing the assemblies without any elections. In Switzerland, where the unitary Government was opposed by the former cantons, he restored peace by arbitration, which reinstated the sovereign Government of each canton. In Germany the lay princes who had ceded possessions to France were indemnified, not by the Diet, the legal authority, but by negotiation with the French Government. They obtained in exchange the territories of the princes of the Church, of almost all the Imperial cities, and of all those lords who had been the direct vassals of the Emperor. The south-west of Germany, the part formerly most split up into small units, became the most completely unified, only four princes remaining, who took the name of king. The princes, making use of their unlimited power, destroyed the old regime. They abolished seignorial rights, with the exception of the feudal dues, and seized the property of the clergy. They granted freedom of religion, labour, and trade and established public trial. They divided up their territory into uniform divisions, each administered by an official. Napoleon converted

the republics bordering upon France into monarchies. In Germany he made use of the princes to bring about the dissolution of the old Empire, and brought them all into a "Confederation of the Rhine," bound by an alliance by which they were obliged to provide him with troops. The German Emperor now assumed the title of Emperor of Austria. He next made war upon Prussia, the ally of Russia, took from her part of her territory, and created a new German kingdom, which he gave to his brother, and a new state consisting of part of Poland. He took possession of the kingdom of Naples, and then that of Spain.

Napoleon was opposed by enemies of two sorts: the great Continental powers (Austria, Prussia, Russia), who were in possession of strong armies, and England, who was mistress of the seas by reason of her fleet. He made war in two forms: military on the Continent and economic against the English people. Having been forced to abandon the invasion of England, which was defended by her fleet, he wished to force her to sue for peace by preventing her from carrying on any trade with the ports of Europe. It was therefore necessary for him to obtain the co-operation of the other states. The English Government had forbidden its subjects to carry on trade on the coasts of the French Empire, and later ordered all neutral ships trading with France to discharge their cargo in a British port and take out a licence. Napoleon rejoined by two measures constituting the "Continental blockade." He first ordered the confiscation of British goods, and next that of all colonial produce and all neutral ships which had touched at a British port. But he granted licences to trade and afterwards allowed the confiscated goods to be sold, which prevented the blockade from producing its full effect.

The inhabitants of foreign lands subject to Napoleon refused to resign themselves to doing without coffee and sugar and the products of English industry. Their governments made no attempt to stop smuggling. In order to check it, Napoleon annexed to the French Empire the coasts of eastern Italy and the North Sea. His dominion also extended over the allied states of Italy, Spain, and Germany. He had persuaded the Tsar of Russia to join in the blockade, and even compelled Austria and Prussia, the two states which had remained independent, to conclude an alliance and, when he broke with the Tsar, to furnish him with troops for the purpose of making war on Russia.

Effects of Napoleon's domination

Napoleon's domination had an effect even upon the lands which withstood him. After its defeat of 1806 in Prussia, the Government felt the necessity for reforming its system. The reform was carried out in the teeth of the King's subjects, the nobles and officials, by German refugees in Prussia, who represented it to the King as a "monarchical revolution" intended to increase his power by giving his subjects the means of serving him better. It consisted in introducing into Prussia institutions copied from France: firstly, a council of ministers, elected municipalities for the towns, the principle of the emancipation of the peasants; next, a reform of the army through the abolition of corporal punishment and the establishment of compulsory military service; and, lastly, the secularization of the property of the Church, the formation of a body of police, the *gendarmes*, and the tax known as the *patente*, which had as its result the establishment of freedom of industry and trade.

In Spain, in the absence of the King, who was detained in France, the insurgent patriots formed a government which summoned a constituent assembly under the old name of *Cortes*. It was elected mainly by the provinces remote from the centre, which were the least attached to the absolute monarchy. It voted the Constitution of 1812, modelled on the French Constitution of 1791, and establishing a limited monarchy with a single assembly.

Foreign domination exasperated the peoples, which were suffering from the passage of armies, requisitions, and war taxation, as well as from the privations caused by the blockade. The privileged classes, who were the leaders of public opinion, felt themselves to be particularly affected, the clergy by the sale of their property, freedom of religion, civil marriage, and divorce, the nobles by the abolition of their legal privileges and rights over the peasants, the officials by the loss of their posts and the refusal to pay their pensions, and the bourgeois by the reduction of interest on Government stock.

This exasperation against the foreigner made men aware of differences between peoples which had been of no interest to the enlightened men of the eighteenth century, accustomed to thinking of humanity rather than of nations. When Napoleon wrote: "There is very little difference between one people and another," he drew the

conclusion that he might impose the French system of government upon every country, ignoring the repugnance of the people. Foreign domination aroused the new sense of nationality. In Spain this was manifested by a rising of the mass of the people, and in Germany by the works of the Romantic writers.

Napoleon continued to carry on the war in order to extend his domination and his blockade. But his armies wasted away first in Germany and afterwards in Spain. The largest of them, half of which was composed of foreign troops, perished in Russia, where it found conditions too unfavourable to a rapid war. In spite of a crisis of unemployment and riots in 1811, England continued to resist him because the wealth accumulated by her trade gave her the means of contracting an enormous debt. The four great Coalition powers took the offensive, concentrating their whole force according to the Napoleonic method. A decisive battle in 1813 led to the evacuation of Germany, the invasion of France, and the fall of Napoleon.

Nothing remained of his domination, France losing even the territories acquired during the Revolution. But the French armies had introduced into Europe a new system of government based upon the principles of the Revolution — not the sovereignty of the people as exercised by elected assemblies, but private liberty and equality before the law, subject to a centralized and absolute power. This change did not affect the extremities of Europe, Great Britain, Portugal, Sweden, or Russia, but some trace of it remained in all the countries which had been subject to Napoleon or to princes dependent upon him: the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, and Spain.

The general result was the abolition or weakening of aristocratic and ecclesiastical power, the legal privileges of the nobles and lords, the material authority of the clergy, the principalities and domains of the Church, almost all religious houses, ecclesiastical courts, and the Inquisition. Another result was the abolition of the corporations and regulations concerned with crafts and agriculture. Out of the destruction of these arose a system of private liberties — freedom of worship, marriage, settlement, movement, agriculture, industry, and trade — a system of civil equality before the law, and, in theory, equality of access to public office and equal conditions of taxation and military service. Political power remained exclusively in the hands of sovereigns and their agents, but since they had rid themselves of

Social changes

the resistance of other powers, they were able to follow the example of France by establishing a uniform system of territorial divisions and setting up a body of professional officials, administrative, judicial, and fiscal. The relations between the government and its subjects assumed a more rational, equal, and simple form.

The change was most complete and lasting in the lands — Belgium and the Rhine lands — annexed before 1800, a little less so in northern Italy, fairly considerable in southern Germany, where the princes had been the protégés of Napoleon, and in Prussia, where it had taken place indirectly through imitation of France; it was smallest in Poland and the Illyrian provinces, which had no middle classes and where French domination had been shortlived. The political life of Europe emerged from this crisis transformed, in a similar spirit to that of the eighteenth century, in the direction of “enlightened despotism,” provided with a rational system of government and granting private liberty to its subjects.

Social changes

The Revolution and the wars had caused a social and economic crisis which caused a more or less profound transformation of European society in the various countries. In France, where the Revolution had systematically abolished all privileged bodies and legal differences between one person and another, the upheaval was complete. Its victims were the two upper classes. Not only were the nobles deprived of their privileges and pre-eminence of rank, but many of them were executed and a very large number ruined by the confiscation of the property of émigrés and those condemned to death. The clergy lost its material authority, all its domains and revenues, its religious houses, and some of its priests. Those who remained were drawn into the conflict between the constitutional and refractory clergy and afterwards deprived of all stipends and forced to go into hiding. The Concordat restored only some of the bishops and parish priests and granted them only slender stipends.

It was the bourgeois who profited most from the Revolution. They occupied almost all public offices, and increased their wealth by the purchase of national property taken from the clergy and nobles, by speculation in securities, and by army contracts. The Revolution also improved the position of the peasants, who were freed from

tithes, feudal dues, and even the payments due to their lord. The artisans, freed from their guild regulations, were now free to make and sell goods as they chose, and journeymen and home-workers had the right to set up in business on their own account when they possessed sufficient means. But the wage-earners and agricultural labourers did not benefit by the new regime, for it granted freedom of labour only to individuals. In France a law of 1791 had forbidden them to form associations, take concerted measures, or strike. Napoleon created an "Imperial nobility" for his generals and high officials, adorned with ancient titles and endowed with grants, who endeavoured to become absorbed into the old nobility. The blockade caused great losses to the shipbuilders in the ports of the Empire and to wholesale merchants. It protected industrialists against English competition, especially in the iron and textile industries.

In England, as a result of the reaction against the Revolution, the aristocracy of great landowners and clergy, in whose hands lay the power, consolidated their social predominance. The almost uninterrupted continuance of the war for twenty years provoked an economic crisis complicated by the disturbance resulting from previous progress in technical methods. The population increased rapidly, especially in the northern and western regions, where the presence of iron, coal, and waterfalls attracted industrial enterprises. These gave employment to a growing number of workers, who received a rapid training without serving an apprenticeship and were concentrated in large establishments. The employers reduced expenses by lowering wages and engaging unskilled labourers, women, and children as operatives, with the support of Parliament. In order to maintain high rents and prices for land against the competition of foreign wheat, Parliament established import duties which caused a rise in the price of bread. Wage-earners were affected by both the fall in wages and the rise in the price of food. When the workmen called for the application of the law limiting the number of apprentices, Parliament first suspended and then abrogated the law. For agricultural labourers the custom grew up of resorting to an expedient devised in 1795 by a local gathering of justices of the peace. Wages everywhere being notoriously insufficient, the parish was bound to supplement them by relief, fixed by the justices in relation to the price

of bread. The crisis of the blockade led to such unemployment that in 1811 the exasperated workmen went about the country smashing not only the machines used in large-scale industry, but also the looms used by the home-workers.

In the lands of central Europe which had passed under French rule, society underwent the same changes to the detriment of the nobles and clergy as in France, but less markedly to the advantage of the bourgeois and peasants and without any progress worth mentioning in the position of wage-earners. In eastern Europe society was still dominated by the great landowning nobles, who continued to look down upon the villagers and exploit the peasants and even, in Russia, to treat them like slaves.

Intellectual work

Science continued to make progress, mainly through the researches of isolated men of learning. In France, however, the École Polytechnique, founded by the Convention, became a centre for the mathematical and mechanical sciences. Inorganic chemistry was completed by the study of bodies according to a new nomenclature.

Germany, though passively subject to foreign domination in the political sphere, was for the first time taking the leading place in Europe in the creation of intellectual works. The German philosophers Kant and Fichte, resuming the path followed in the seventeenth century, returned to speculation on problems of metaphysics insoluble by scientific methods, thus giving Germany a metaphysical primacy which she retained up to the middle of the nineteenth century. German poetry rose to the highest level it had yet attained in Goethe and Schiller. Next the lyrical poets of the Romantic school were inspired by the new national sentiment. In contrast with the spirit of humanity of the seventeenth century, the conception gained currency of an essential genius peculiar to each people, manifested in the works of its past and the spontaneous output of the popular masses — beliefs, tales, and songs, in which the Romantics sought their material. At the same time the English lyrical poets, who were in sympathy with the Revolution, adopted the romantic form. The French writers of note, even Chateaubriand, were prose-writers and were all foreigners or connected with foreign lands.

Intellectual work

Germany also occupied the first rank in instrumental music, in which Vienna became the most active centre, in competition with the Italians, who turned for preference to opera.

The plastic arts, in which original production was almost entirely concentrated in France, hardly produced any works of importance, except those of the painters belonging to the school of David, which was beginning to shake itself free from the academic style, though the latter continued to dominate architecture.

THE FIRST PART OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

•

THE third of a century between the Restoration of 1814 and the revolutions of 1848 was a time of peace between states and progress in the material life of Europe, during which a decisive change in the political system and in society was in preparation.

The Restoration

The *Allies* — that is, the four great powers forming the Coalition against Napoleon — attempted to restore the state of affairs existing in Europe previous to the Revolution. This *Restoration* started by redistributing the territories reconquered either from the French Empire or from the states which had passed under the domination of Napoleon or been taken from the two kings — of Denmark and Saxony — who had remained his allies. In principle it was meant that these should be restored to their former sovereigns, now proclaimed the *legitimate* ones; but the restoration was not fully carried out.

The Allies did not re-establish any of the republics. That of Venice remained in the possession of Austria; that of Genoa was given to the King of Sardinia; that of the United Provinces was turned into a kingdom of the Netherlands, enlarged by the whole of Belgium and having as its king the heir of the former Stadhouders. None of the ecclesiastical states were restored except the “States of the Church,” the domain of the Pope. Of the old free cities of Germany only four remained. The Emperor of Austria recovered the territory of Milan and combined it with Venetia to form a kingdom governed by a viceroy. The rest of Italy was restored to its former princes, and the name

of Italy disappeared. The King of Saxony lost part of his territory, which was given to Prussia, and the King of Denmark the kingdom of Norway, which was given to the King of Sweden. The partition of Poland was not maintained in its entirety: the part annexed by Prussia in 1795 was formed into a small kingdom of Poland, of which the Tsar proclaimed himself King. Prussia regained Posen and received the territories of the former princes of the Church in Westphalia and on the left bank of the Rhine as compensation for the rest. In view of its consequences this was the most ominous of the changes. Hitherto Prussia had remained an east European state, aristocratic, military, agricultural, and Lutheran; she now became a German state of western Europe, in part Catholic and bourgeois, possessing a territory rich in mines and ready to become an area of heavy industry. She now found herself charged with defending the Rhine against France, formerly her natural ally. Thus Europe was left simplified and reduced to some twenty states, not counting Germany, now a Confederation including no more than thirty-eight members.

The internal system of government in the states was also restored, but to a very unequal extent, and in some countries very incompletely. In France especially, the Restoration was confined to re-establishing the old royal family, but, at the request of the Allies themselves, the "legitimate" King bound himself by the "Constitutional Charter (*Charte*)" to maintain all innovations introduced since 1789, and even the acquisition of property confiscated from the clergy and *émigrés*. It left undisturbed all Government officials, whether of Revolutionary, bourgeois, or military origin. The kingdom of the Netherlands, which took the place of a confederation of provinces with unequal rights, formed a centralized unitary state with a single assembly. Switzerland retained its new Constitution of 1802, its neutrality being placed under a European guarantee. In all other states the ruler regained his power, which was in theory unlimited and had actually increased since the powers of the nobles and clergy and provincial customs had been destroyed by French domination.

Henceforward the system of government in every state depended upon the will of the legitimate prince, and most of them upheld absolutism, accepting neither limits nor control. A few in Germany, especially those whose territory bordered upon France, granted a Constitution copied from the French *Charte*, defining their powers

and the rights of their subjects, and created two chambers, one of them elective. The King of the Netherlands established a "fundamental law" providing for the setting up of an assembly. Sweden preserved its ancient Diet; Norway, having revolted against annexation, received in 1814 a Constitution copied from the French constitution of 1791 and had an elected assembly, though this met only every three years, so that the real power remained in the hands of the ministers, chosen by the King of Sweden. Hungary, which had remained a separate kingdom, retained its aristocratic Diet, which was very seldom summoned. The kingdom of Poland received from the Tsar a Constitution and a Diet. In all those states in which there was an assembly, its functions were confined to voting the laws and taxation proposed by the Government. The ministers were chosen by the prince from outside the assembly and depended upon him alone.

The system in England was different, for the king had acquired the habit of choosing members of Parliament as his ministers and allowing them to govern, without appearing at the Council himself. But the theory that the minister must govern in harmony with the majority in the House was not yet definitely accepted by the Tory party, which was then in power, and was only accepted in 1834. In France the king had the right to choose his ministers, but the practice still varied, and, as in England, most of the ministers were chosen among the members of the Chambers.

Unlike the practice of the French Revolutionary assemblies, a rule common to all monarchies forbade the payment of any salary to the elected deputies, the result of which was to exclude men with no means. The electoral system varied, but in all states the right of election was a privilege reserved to property-owners. The electoral qualification in England was ownership of real estate, in France payment of direct taxation. In the northern lands, following the tradition of the Middle Ages, voting was oral and public, but in France and those countries which had adopted the French system it was written and secret.

All constitutional monarchies tolerated the growth of political practices differing greatly from those of the eighteenth century. The government allowed the newspapers to print information about public affairs and discuss political questions. It had to abandon the censorship and recognize a "liberty of the press," the extent of which in

Types of opposition and agitation

the various countries was subject to very unequal limitations in the shape of police supervision or prosecution before the courts. The English system of trial by jury was applied to press trials in France. Subjects, or at least the more well-to-do of them, could obtain information about the acts of the Government and the criticisms of it in the Chambers. Thus the action of public opinion on the government of states began.

Relations between the states were based upon a principle defined in the declarations issued by the Allies after the defeat of Napoleon: that of "basing peace upon a just division of strength" between the powers, or upon "a lasting system of equilibrium." Thus a "European equilibrium" was established, maintained by the "concert of Europe"—that is, by agreement between the "great powers," which decided among themselves the general affairs of Europe, without consulting the other states. The governments at the Congress of Vienna had guaranteed the states no more than the maintenance of their territory. But the return of Napoleon in 1815 made them dread another revolution. To prevent this they established a system of supervision over the internal affairs of France, exercised by a conference of their ambassadors in Paris, and agreed to hold meetings for the purpose of examining measures for the maintenance of peace. These were the "conferences" and *congresses* held between 1818 and 1822. This agreement between the four opponents of Napoleon was wrongly known as the "Holy Alliance," by confusion with the real Holy Alliance, the work of the Tsar Alexander, in which England refused to join and to which the King of France was admitted.

Types of opposition and agitation

The system established in 1814 caused discontent in various quarters for different reasons. Those who desired a constitution, assemblies, elections, and the liberty of the press were annoyed by absolutism. The redistribution of territory had established states which did not coincide with nations—Germany, Italy, and Poland being partitioned among several states, while, on the other hand, the Austrian Empire included in the same state a number of nations foreign to one another—Germans, Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, Croats, and Italians. This system angered both the partisans of na-

tional unity, who desired to combine their whole nation in a single state, and, on the other hand, those under the rule of a foreign government, who desired to be governed by men of their own nationality. Those opposed to absolutism formed a *liberal* opposition, and those dissatisfied with the distribution of territory a national opposition. The two types of opposition, usually carried on by the same persons, were not recruited among the great mass of the nation — the peasants, artisans, traders, and employees, who had no thought of resisting the Government. Almost all those in opposition belonged to the middle classes, enjoying leisure and some education — lawyers, doctors, men of letters, students, or young officers. Their means of action were weak; they worked by means of secret societies or military revolts, first in Spain, Portugal, and Italy and afterwards in France and Russia.

These revolts provided the great absolutist powers — Russia, Austria, and Prussia — with an occasion for proclaiming that they possessed the right of armed intervention, not only to uphold the territorial settlement, but to restore the absolute power of the legitimate sovereign. This “*principle of intervention*” was applied by the Austrian troops in Italy and by the French army in Spain. The English Government protested that “The Alliance was not conceived as a union for the government of the world and the superintendence of the affairs of other States.”

The concert of the great powers, shaken by the opposition of the English Government to the principle of intervention, definitively broke up on account of two regions which had not been included in the settlement of the Congress of Vienna: the revolting South American colonies, which finally formed themselves into republics whose independence was recognized by England; and the Ottoman Empire, where the Greek Christians revolted against the Moslem Sultan and were supported by England and afterwards by the Tsar.

In the constitutional monarchies the opposition was concerned only with the working of the Government. In France the so-called “independent” or “liberal” opposition was at odds with the *ultras*, who were demanding the restitution of their property to the *émigrés* and the restoration of their power to the clergy. In England the Whig party, which came to call itself *Liberal*, demanded reform of the old

electoral system, which gave a very small minority of electors the majority of members. A new *Radical* party, formed by workmen, called for a “ radical reform ” by means of universal suffrage.

Antagonism between states

After 1830 relations among the states were upset by a change in the internal government of two of the great powers. In France the Revolution of 1830, starting as a conflict between the King and the liberal majority in the Chamber, was completed, under the tricolour flag, by an insurrection of the people of Paris, who had remained hostile to the Bourbons. It retained the Charter in a revised form, but fundamentally changed the character of the Government, excluding from it the *legitimists* — that is, the nobility and clergy — and bringing into power the rich bourgeois, who were liberal and free-thinking. The King was obliged to govern in accordance with the new principle of government, known in English as *responsible*, and in French as *parliamentary*, in which ministers are responsible to the Chambers — that is, are bound to resign if they are not in agreement with the majority in the elected Chamber. In practice this system led to the adoption of the leaders of the majority party as ministers, which made the real power pass into the hands of elected persons. In England the system was changed by reform of the electoral system, which had been demanded for the last half-century. A majority consisting of a coalition between the Liberal minority and the dissident Tories passed it through the House. In order to obtain its acceptance by the House of Lords, it was necessary to make use of the workmen, who alarmed the Lords by mass demonstrations and persuaded them to yield.

The result was to give the majority and the Government to the Liberal party, which reformed municipal administration by giving it to elected councils.

Henceforth the great powers of Europe were divided into two groups with two opposing political systems. In the east and centre there were the three absolutist monarchies, in the west the two parliamentary monarchies. Each group tended to uphold the system analogous to its own in the smaller states, and resorted to armed intervention either to support or to crush a liberal revolution. The liberal states assisted the Belgians, who had revolted against the King

of the Netherlands, in setting up an independent kingdom of Belgium with a liberal Constitution. But the Tsar of Russia, inspired by contrary sentiments, crushed the revolt of the Poles and incorporated the country in his Empire, while Austria put down revolts in the small Italian states.

Later England and France intervened in the two kingdoms of Portugal and Spain to support the two Queens dowager exercising the regency in the name of their daughters against the two uncles of the Queens, who were still minors, the uncles being in favour of absolute government. To win the support of the liberals, the Regents accepted a Constitution. Spain and Portugal became constitutional monarchies. The supreme power, contested between two parties, was in point of fact exercised by the generals.

In states with a liberal government political life was marked by incessant party struggles in the Chambers and the press. A *democratic* opposition arose which protested against electoral privileges. It found its largest body of partisans in England, where the manual labourers organized themselves into a Labour party, known as the *Chartists*, to demand universal suffrage by means of mass demonstrations and the presentation of a monster petition to the House three times. In France it first took the form of rioting in Paris for the purpose of overthrowing the Government, and afterwards of an agitation among the National Guards in favour of "electoral reform." In Switzerland the new *Radical* party, formed in 1830, established universal suffrage in the cantons in which it had gained power, and demanded the reform of the Confederation so as to establish universal suffrage in all of them and strengthen the power of the Federal Government. The agitation led to a civil war against the Catholic cantons, united in a "*Sonderbund*" (separate league), and to the victory of the Radicals.

In Russia the Tsar stiffened absolutist government by creating a political police which kept a strict watch over education, books, meetings, and private life, in such a way as to isolate the Russian people from Europe. But the King of Prussia, desirous of raising a loan, summoned all the provincial assemblies in the kingdom to a joint general assembly. The Austrian Government allowed the Hungarian Diet to adopt Magyar as its official language. National sentiment began to be awakened in Bohemia and Croatia by the use of Slav

Progress in production

languages. In Italy the movement in favour of unity succeeded in manifesting itself openly, with the support of some of the princes. Beginning in Piedmont, it took the form of a "*risorgimento*" (resurrection) of the spirit of Italy and succeeded in obtaining from the sovereigns the promise of a liberal regime.

The antagonism between the two groups of states became softened after 1840, while the agreement between the members of each group was ceasing to exist. The harmony between France and England was shaken by a conflict over the Pasha of Egypt, in which France found herself isolated in face of the four former Allies of 1814. It broke down over the question of Spain, whereupon Louis Philippe tried to draw closer to the absolute monarchies.

Progress in production

Agriculture still remained the means of existence of the great majority of the populations of Europe and required a great deal of labour for a small amount of production. The only progress of importance in cultivation and stock-breeding took place in countries in which Dutch and English methods were used: the new rotation of crops, in which wheat alternated with artificial forage crops (lucerne, clover, sainfoin, and beet), the use of ploughshares which turned up the ground to a great depth, the abolition of the fallow periods, the feeding of cattle indoors for part of the time with forage crops, and their improvement by the selection of breeding animals. This progress was still confined to Belgium, England, the north of France, and the west of Germany. Even where farming methods were on this higher level, there were still as yet no chemical manures or agricultural machinery; work was still done with the old implements, the scythe, sickle, and flail, and required a large number of labourers. The most paying crops were still the vine and olive and such industrial crops as flax, hemp, colza, the mulberry, and madder, grown chiefly in the Mediterranean regions — Italy, Spain (which also cultivated the orange-tree), and the south of France, as well as on the vine-clad hills which produced fine vintages. The invention of beet sugar had recently led to the cultivation of sugar-beet.

Just as agricultural labour was still carried out chiefly by peasants, so industrial labour was still chiefly in the hands of artisans working on their own account. It was now that the new technical inventions

discovered in England during the eighteenth century brought about the "industrial revolution," particularly in those parts of England where there were coal, iron, and water-power. Coal-mining, iron- and steel-manufacture, and the spinning of cotton, and afterwards wool, by machinery brought together a large number of workmen in the same establishment.

Most of the industries organized for large-scale production still continued to give out the work to home-workers, this system applying to cutlery, iron goods, clocks and watches, bronze, toys, straw and knitted goods. Home-weaving, no longer able to compete with machines, became affected by unemployment and the number of looms decreased everywhere. But machinery driven by steam was still rare. It was on the English model, with English machines, sometimes smuggled into the country, and often with English workmen, that coke-furnaces for smelting, spinning-machines, and afterwards power-looms began to be set up in the more advanced parts of the Continent: at Liège, St. Gall, in the north of France, Alsace, and the Rhineland.

Trade and credit

Trade benefited by the progress in means of communication, which had become more economical, especially internal transport by water in boats on the rivers and canals of England and Belgium, and at sea in steamships propelled by paddle-wheels. On land, roads were greatly improved by the process invented by a Scotch engineer, Macadam, who replaced heavy paving by a layer of finely crushed stones compressed by a roller. Travellers used the new coach service with rapid *diligences*, or stagecoaches, for which relays of horses were posted along the route. The railway was created by the combination of *rails* (already an old invention) with the *locomotive*, invented by an Englishman and perfected in France. It started in England, over a short course, and was imitated in Belgium, Germany, and France.

Internal trade still had as its principal commodity the grain required by the great cities, which was transported by water or in carts, and the price of which still varied widely according to the yield of the crop. Overseas trade with foreign lands increased greatly in England, which exported colonial produce, coffee, sugar, and tobacco, now in more general use, and, above all, the products of its great

textiles and metallurgical industries. It imported raw materials: wood, cotton, and wool and sometimes grain. Wholesale trade was carried out on the produce exchanges by exhibiting samples.

Foreign trade was still hampered by measures for keeping money in the country and preventing foreign competition in industry, in accordance with mercantilist theory. French industrialists, and especially the iron-masters and manufacturers of sewing-thread and cotton and woollen textiles, persuaded the Chambers to impose very high import duties, and even obtained the exclusion of certain English products. In 1815, at the request of the landowners, the English Government had imposed almost prohibitive duties on the import of grain, and later a "sliding scale" of duties, varying with the price in the home market. It gradually relaxed this system, decreased the import duties on colonial produce and the products of foreign industry, stopped the embargo on foreign vessels, then the monopoly of the trading companies, and finally, after the Irish famine of 1846, abolished all duties on wheat. The English industrialists, who had no reason to fear foreign competition, set up an organization in Manchester in favour of *free trade* among states. The Prussian Government, obliged to keep watch over a very long frontier-line, which made smuggling easy, concluded a "Customs Union" with almost all the smaller German states, which greatly reduced import duties.

Credit was becoming more and more active with the increase of negotiable securities, State loans and shares in limited companies engaged in shipping and industry, which were dealt in on the Exchanges. The State banks of England and France still issued only small quantities of notes, and those only of the larger denominations. Banking transactions were still carried on by private banks, which issued notes and made payments. Credit was still used chiefly to substitute paper for money, so as to facilitate its circulation, and for making short-term loans on bills payable at a fixed date. It was the Scottish banks that started making long-term loans to industrial or shipping enterprises. Credit became international in the Swiss banking-houses which issued State loans and in the banks of the Rothschild family, managed by five brothers who had established themselves in five European cities.

Social changes

The population was increasing more rapidly than in former days, on the one hand in the most thinly populated regions of eastern Europe (Russia, Austria, and eastern Germany), and on the other hand in the industrial countries of Great Britain and Belgium. The birth-rate was still very high, even in France.

The great majority of the population still lived in the country districts, except in Great Britain and Belgium. There were still only forty-two cities in Europe with more than a hundred thousand inhabitants, having a total population amounting to twelve millions.

As a result of the Revolution, society was changing in western and central Europe, where the abolition of privileges had decreased the inequality between the various classes in the social scale and private liberty had thrown down the barriers between men of different rank. It was changing but little in the countries of eastern Europe, where the old regime was still in force.

Peasants still formed the majority everywhere except in England. Where they worked on their own account as peasant proprietors, farmers, tenants, or *métayers* on a small scale, their position continued to improve; but it was still wretched in a few over-populated countries, in southern Italy and especially in Ireland, where they lived on a piece of land sublet by the agent of a great estate. The agricultural labourers employed on the great estates in Italy, Spain, and England, which were farmed for the landowner's direct profit, still lived in a precarious condition with very low wages and were miserably housed and fed. But the English system of out-relief was abolished in 1835 because it imposed too heavy a poor-rate on the taxpayers.

In eastern Europe (Austria, Hungary, Poland) the peasant still lived on a great domain and was bound to perform forced labour, or else worked as a mere day-labourer and was subject to the landlord's jurisdiction. Even in Prussia the abolition of feudal dues, which did not take place till after 1815, under the influence of the nobles, benefited only the well-to-do peasants who were the hereditary tenants of their land and owned a team of oxen. The others, forming the great mass of the peasants, were granted personal liberty, but deprived of their land, which was added to their master's domain.

Social changes

Those working with hand-implements were now mere labourers employed on the estate in return for a very small wage and a piece of land granted them by the landowner on a precarious tenure. In the kingdom of Poland, where the peasants had been liberated on the same system in the time of Napoleon, they remained exempt from personal obligations, but were reduced to the status of labourers on the great domains.

In the Russian Empire the peasants were still bound to the soil which they tilled, and helplessly abandoned to the arbitrary power of the nobles, who employed them in their houses as domestic servants or sent them away to work as artisans, subject to the payment of a due, or *obrok*, and sometimes even sold them off the domain.

The Christian peasants in the Balkan Peninsula, which was still subject to the Sultan, lived under a variety of systems. In Bulgaria, where the land had been split up into great domains (*chiflik*), each the property of a Moslem warrior, the peasants lived about the person of their master in a servile condition. In the mountainous regions in Serbia and Greece, where the Moslems kept only garrisons, the peasants continued to own their lands and had even retained their local chiefs. They gained their freedom after the creation of a kingdom of Greece, and in Serbia after the departure of the garrisons of janizaries. Rumania, where the boyars still owned their great domains, was, like Poland, a land in which the peasants remained subject to the great landowners.

The change in the technical methods of industry had altered the proportion between the three kinds of workmen employed in industry. It had reduced the numbers of craftsmen and increased those of factory workers concentrated in large establishments. Home-workers decreased in the textile industries, in which the rise of machines was spreading, but increased in those crafts which were organized on the contract system. Yet the craftsmen still formed the large majority of industrial workers, except in the heavy industries confined to limited areas. With the exception of those employed in building — masons, stone-cutters, carpenters, and tilers, whose work could only be paid for in wages, but whose mode of life and outlook were those of the craftsmen — they sold their own work to local customers. Transport workers — carters, coachmen, and seamen in the navy or mercantile marine — belonged to the same social category, though

Social changes

they worked for a wage. At that time they were the most active and independent among the working classes, having a craftsman's conscience and self-respect.

Wage-earners employed in large-scale industry, either in factories or as home-workers, still formed an unorganized mass of men, women, and children, many of them coming from the country, who served no regular apprenticeship, had no connection with the place where they worked, and subsisted on nothing but a precarious wage, in constant dread of unemployment. They had none of the things which had given the craftsmen a stable position — organization, a long apprenticeship, personal relations, a permanent establishment, the traditions of their craft, and a pride in it. All concerted action, such as associations or strikes, was forbidden them by law. The length of the working day, which was left to the master's discretion even for women and children, was far too long for their health. Where industry was organized on a large scale, especially in England, the workers lived huddled together in dwellings that were too small, gloomy, dirty, and badly ventilated, and had only insufficient or badly prepared food, which caused excess in drink. The children were pale, sickly, and often misshapen.

Having failed to obtain the continued observance of the ancient regulations, the English workmen sought to improve their lot by forming "*trade unions*" among the workers belonging to the same craft in the same town, which acted as mutual aid societies and were used to discuss wages and hours of work with the employers. In 1825 they obtained the passage of a law authorizing *trade unions* and strikes, but the affiliation of unions was still prohibited and cases were tried by justices of the peace hostile to associations of workmen and inclined to condemn them as conspiracy.

Above the great mass of manual labourers in agriculture and industry there was growing up a type intermediate between the "people" and the upper classes, made up of small tradesmen, subordinate employees, and schoolmasters and, in the large cities, those employed in the food-supply trades — butchers, pork-butchers, or pastry-cooks. They were distinguished from the others by their dress, speech, and mode of life and had usually received the elementary education necessary for keeping their books; but they were not admitted into bourgeois society, their wives were not ladies, and the

marriage of their daughters with bourgeois would have been a misalliance.

The part of the urban population known in France as the bourgeoisie still continued to increase in wealth and power. Since it furnished all the leading men in industry, trade, and banking, all lawyers, doctors, and professors, and almost all the officials, it took the lead in both economic and intellectual life. Hence it was the class that profited most by the changes introduced into life by technical progress, the increase of wealth, and the spread of education. It was distinguished from the mass of the people by its manners and speech, and its sons were educated in secondary schools (*collèges*), in which, even in England and Germany, Latin was taught.

Yet the upper class was still the nobility, which continued to feel a sense of social superiority based upon its ancient origin, strengthened by dislike of the innovations due to the Revolution, and maintained by the habit of regarding marriage with bourgeois as a misalliance. But an increasing number of new families of bourgeois origin were entering it, in England by buying an estate, so that they became absorbed into the gentry; in the German lands by acquiring a title of nobility which the princes granted to their officials; and in Russia by discharging one of those functions which conferred nobility. It was only in the lands consisting of great domains and having no bourgeois — Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the Baltic lands — that the nobility remained a closed class. A sense of brotherhood was still felt by the nobles throughout the whole of Europe, which made marriages possible and facilitated personal relations. This kept up among the nobility a little of the international character which it had had in the eighteenth century. It was beginning to imitate English customs — English topcoats and hats, horseracing and betting, whist-playing, and aristocratic clubs.

In all the Protestant lands the clergy had ceased to form a class apart. The pastors became assimilated to the bourgeoisie, and in England the prelates to the aristocracy. The Catholic clergy, reduced in number and wealth by the suppression of the monastic orders in France and the secularization of their property, even in Spain, was no longer recruited from the nobility, but from the middle or lower middle classes and even from peasant families. The Society of Jesus, restored by the Pope in 1814, resumed its work in all the Catholic

The new conditions of life

countries, founding schools at which rich and noble families had their sons educated. It once more assumed the guidance of the court and Government in Austria, Spain, and the small Italian states and even gained an influence in France which disquieted Gallican Catholics. The regular clergy had been reconstituted under the form of congregations, especially of women, who now often did not take perpetual vows. In all Catholic countries they performed the functions of hospital nurses and teachers in primary schools, at which girls of the lower class were educated, and convent schools, attended by the daughters of the nobility and bourgeoisie.

The new conditions of life

Material life was now beginning to change in the parts of Europe most advanced in civilization, as a result of inventions and new habits, most of which came from Great Britain. It would take too long to describe them; it will suffice here to enumerate and attempt to classify them.

Technical inventions served to make life more convenient. They have so completely entered into the life of all countries that we find it difficult to imagine how Europe had done without them. They were: chemical matches made with sulphur, and afterwards phosphorus, which did away with the long and difficult operation of striking the flint and steel, catching the spark on the tinder, and bringing it in contact with the substance to be lit; the oil lamp, with a mechanism moved by a spring for drawing up the oil regularly; stearine candles, which took the place of tallow dips requiring to be snuffed; steel pens instead of goose-quills; beet sugar, which made sugar, preserves, and sweetmeats, hitherto expensive luxuries, into articles of general consumption; gas lamps, first used in London for lighting streets and shops; the use of coal fires, making it possible to replace open fires by stoves, giving a greater and steadier heat, and more suitable in cold, damp weather; the building of tall houses divided into several storeys, which made it possible to let lodgings to the floating bourgeois population; the use of trousers instead of knee-breeches, and shoes instead of boots; and postage stamps, invented in England, which made it unnecessary to collect postage from the receiver of the letter.

Care of the person and healthful habits came principally from England. These were, first and foremost, the habit of cleanliness,

Changes in popular ideas

instead of the dirtiness which had been general in all classes of society in every land: bathrooms and the use of hot baths, which very slowly made their way over the whole of Europe, and water-closets, which took the place of the old cesspool. German doctors invented hydrotherapy, or cold-water cures, and preventive treatment by dieting.

New amusements served to increase the amenities of life. There was travel for pleasure, brought into fashion by the English, and tourist travel, whose name indicates its Swiss and German origin, both of which took people to those natural beauties which it had become the fashion to admire — the sea and high mountains, especially the Alps, or the artistic beauties and classical memories of Italy. There were social gatherings, especially evening parties or balls given either by private persons or in a public hall by subscription. The attraction of these was dancing, which took new forms, abandoning the dances of the eighteenth century and adopting the German waltz, such Polish dances as the polka, mazurka, and redowa, the Spanish quadrille, the English country-dance, and the Scottish schottische. Almost all of these were dances for couples, in which it became the custom for the man to hold his partner by the waist. The theatres, which in the eighteenth century had been frequented chiefly by officers and those about the court, now attracted a wider public. Books, and even newspapers, were still luxuries, but were made more accessible by the use of lending and circulating libraries.

These innovations, which made life more convenient or pleasanter, chiefly benefited the middle classes. They made bourgeois conditions of life more like those of the noble and wealthy. They were coming into use chiefly in the richer and more civilized countries and did not much affect the mass of the people — the manual labourers, shopkeepers, and employees — so that the gulf between these and the bourgeoisie grew wider.

Changes in popular ideas

Intellectual life reached the mass of the people not through the sciences or arts, which were confined to a small minority of writers, artists, and amateurs, but in the form of beliefs and doctrines connected with the subjects that interested them — religion, politics, and the organization of society.

The most ancient forms of belief still remained in full vigour everywhere, especially in the country districts. Among them were belief in apparitions of the dead, magic, divination, the interpretation of dreams, miraculous cures, charms, amulets, and gestures intended to avert evil spells. The more recent beliefs introduced by the Christian religion were summarized in formulas which found their way into the very depths of the people by means of the catechism, sermons, prayers, hymns, devotional books, and in the Protestant countries the reading of the Bible, often organized in the form of family prayers.

Scientific progress in the knowledge of the universe and the new conception of the relations between God and man had estranged a section of high society from Christian doctrine; but the French Revolution had brought about a change in the feelings of the privileged classes by giving them the impression that a revolt against traditional religion encouraged people to revolt against political authority and the social system. They drew the conclusion that some religion is necessary to the people and that those in high places ought to set them an example. Noble or rich families returned to the practice of the Christian religion, even in Orthodox Russia. In all countries free thought came to be regarded by good society as in bad taste. The inhabitants of the industrial cities in England, finding the established Church too lukewarm, turned to the worship of the Dissenting "chapels."

The return to the practice of religion had not revived interest in doctrine. This remained a subject of study for future ecclesiastics in the Catholic seminaries, where it was taught in the spirit of St. Thomas Aquinas, and in the Protestant theological faculties, where it was being shaken by rationalist criticism and a historical study of the changes in dogma. But believers no longer took a passionate interest in the question of salvation, having been freed from fear of the eternal punishments of hell, in which they no longer really believed. Good conduct seemed more important than faith.

Diverted from religious doctrine, intellectual activity was transferred to politics, openly in countries enjoying political liberty (Great Britain, France, Sweden, Belgium, Scandinavia, and a few small German states) and in the form of secret meetings or associations and the reading of forbidden books in those which remained under an absolutist regime. In politics, as in religion, theories beyond the

grasp of the average intelligence were condensed into formulas expressing or provocative of feeling. These were disseminated by quite other means than religious doctrines, through press controversies, debates in assemblies, the "professions of faith" issued by candidates, public meetings, political songs and catchwords, and mottoes on banners. They did not, like religious formulas, become current among peasants, women, and children, but reached only men of the upper classes and a small portion of the labouring classes. They produced a totally different effect from religious doctrines. Whereas religion, being imposed by an absolute authority, preserved unity of belief, political theories, being freely chosen as the result of personal feelings which varied with the individual, ended by splitting up the people into *parties*, each professing a different ideal, expressed in different formulas of government.

There was a fundamental difference between the partisans of tradition, known as *conservatives*, whose ideal it was to preserve the established system founded upon authority, and the *liberals*, the partisans of innovations demanded in the name of liberty for purposes of improvement. The antagonism between them was defined in formulas. On the conservative side these were: respect for custom, the maintenance of order, and fidelity to the dynasty; on the liberal side they were: reason, progress, individual liberty, and the sovereignty of the people. In practice political liberty meant the right of carrying on opposition to the government without risk of being prevented by force. In France, before 1848, the essential problem of political life presented itself in the form of "reconciling order with liberty." The partisans of innovation did not form such a homogeneous party as the conservatives, but were divided on the subject of the amount of change to be made in the political system, and, above all, the extent of the political rights to be granted to the mass of the people as regards the franchise. It was this divergence which gave birth in England to a party of "radical reform" known as the *Radical* party.

In Germany, where only a few small states allowed their subjects a little liberty, political theories did not reach the mass of the bourgeoisie; they remained the special sphere of certain university professors. The liberal Germans of the south accepted the formulas of the French liberals; those of the north tried to preserve the connection

between political liberty and tradition. Instead of basing it, as in England and France, on the inherent right of the individual, they derived it from the people, conceived, not as a collection of individuals, but as a sort of natural organism having its own peculiar genius, differing radically from that of other peoples. They did not admit any common rights derived from the nature of man, but recognized only a particular right pertaining to each people, which they claimed to discover in the ancient customs in which its peculiar genius was manifested. Hence they demanded political liberty only in the name of the ancient privileges of established bodies consecrated by custom, which gave the aristocracy a right to resist the arbitrary acts of the government. This they called "historic right." They called themselves the "historical school," because they appealed to history, as opposed to the revolutionary theory of the rights of man.

All these different theories, even that of the partisans of the Revolution, concurred in recognizing property as a natural right inherent in the nature of man and indispensable to his activity, and admitting that its nature was unlimited in both extent and duration, so that it became hereditary and transferable. Hence arose the idea of liberty in economic matters, freedom of cultivation, industry, and internal trade, the result of which was to abolish all regulations and prohibitions and allow individuals to transact business by private contracts, without State intervention. Only trade between nations remained subject to regulation in the interest of producers, but English industrialists, who did not require protection because they supplied the foreign market, demanded "free trade" — that is, liberty in international trade.

Social theories

A new type of doctrine, relating not to government but to the organization of society, was formulated simultaneously in England and France by philanthropists who adopted the name of *Socialists*. They had meditated upon the economic bases of society, the part played by industry, the wretched condition of the wage-earners, the vices of competition, and the reasons explaining property and inheritance; they had made a critical review of the social system and elaborated projects of reform. This work, which before 1830 was

carried on separately in England and France by isolated philanthropists (Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier), produced formulas and projects which were disseminated through the world of labour after 1830. In France the adherents of these theories, reviving memories of the Revolution, took the name of *Communists*; in England, under the name of *Chartists*, they tried to unite all workers in a class in conflict with the rest.

Before 1848 this process of thought, which was the work of the French and English, had already produced all the criticisms of society, propagandist formulas, and projects of reform on which Socialism has lived. The French provided the general ideas, the criticism of the profoundest bases of society (property, inheritance, and the family), regarded as the indispensable foundations of civilized life, and criticism of the whole doctrine of the economists with regard to "economic liberty": competition in trade, which they denounced as "anarchy of exchange," industrial freedom, based on the wage-contract, which they declared to be inequitable as between the owner of capital, who was in a position to fix wages, and the workman, who had nothing but his work to offer and was unable to wait. From France, too, came the Socialist formulas: organization of labour, the right to work, exploitation of man by man, the emancipation and dictatorship of the proletariat, such general terms as social revolution, communism, and anarchism — and its emblem, the red flag. The English contributed chiefly the practical procedure of partial reform: *unions* of workers, *congresses* of labour delegates, *co-operatives*, laws for the protection of labour, superannuation funds, credit banks, the eight-hour day, the general strike, and universal suffrage.

The Germans who entered this movement were workmen employed in France or the Rhineland and a few refugees. Marx, a German Jew living abroad, embodied the work of the Socialists in a dogmatic system which he expounded before the Revolution of 1848 in the *Communist Manifesto*, ending in the formula: "Proletarians of every land, unite!"

Science, literature, and the arts

Science was making rapid progress. Scientific research, which in the universities of Germany and the higher specialized schools in

France went hand-in-hand with teaching, was becoming a regular profession. The increasing numbers of men of learning in every land used the same methods, working by means of observation and experiment without concerning themselves with the practical application of their discoveries. They sought to discover *laws* — that is, constant sequences of phenomena, that should become increasingly accurate, so that it should be possible to apply mathematics to them, and increasingly generalized, so that it might be possible to refer to a common conception of the universe the phenomena which had hitherto been studied separately.

The progress in physics at this time was made through the law of the conservation and equivalence of forces (motion, heat, electricity, magnetism) and the theory of light-waves; in chemistry through the success of organic synthesis and the theory of atomic weights; in physiology through histology and the distinction between the sensory and motor nerves; in the natural sciences through the development of palæontology and the theory of the influence of environment on the modification of species; and in geology through the idea of a gradual evolution.

The intellectual sciences were beginning to take shape through the historical study of language, religion, customs, and law, which gave rise to linguistics, philology, and archæology. German metaphysics was bringing forth its last original work, Hegelianism, which issued in two opposing theories: justification of the absolute power of the State, and Socialist materialism.

Literature was beginning to become a profession and provided the public with an increasingly abundant output. It was still dominated by the Romantic movement, which was producing its last works in Germany. In England and, above all, in France it was developing into a revolt of the young against the rules of classic art and producing a crop of poetry of a lyrical character, which poured itself out in effusions of personal feeling, in a form which was often careless. The historical novel was reaching its greatest vogue, and the novel of contemporary manners was reaching its highest level of power at once in France and in England with Balzac and Dickens.

The Romantic movement was also permeating the plastic arts. In architecture it was marked by a return to the styles of the Middle

Ages, in sculpture by the endeavour to give an impression of movement, in painting by the revolt of the "colourists" against the correct draughtsmanship of the "academic" school.

Music was still divided between two increasingly divergent tendencies: Italian operatic music, which consisted chiefly of melodies, intended to be sung by the virtuoso, and German music, in which the melody, supported by skilful orchestration, was expressing emotion with an unprecedented power.

REVOLUTIONS AND REFORMS

•

The quarter of a century between the Revolution of '48 and the foundation of the German Empire was a time of revolutions and political reforms which transformed the political and social life of Europe, while technical progress was changing its conditions of material life.

The Revolution of 1848

The Revolution started in an unexpected fashion. In every state there were many disaffected elements of various sorts, but in none of them were these strong enough to impose upon the Government a change in the political system. In England, the only country in which the masses carried on a powerful agitation, no revolution took place. The governments were, however, quite inadequately prepared for resistance to an attack. They had no experience of police measures and kept only small numbers of troops in the capital, armed with guns that took a long time to discharge and having no experience of street-fighting, besides which at that time the narrow, winding streets could easily be closed by means of barricades. The acute crisis began in France with the Revolution of February 1848. It arose out of the agitation for electoral reform and was the work of a small group of republicans who had stirred up the working-class quarters of Paris. It was imitated in all the states of central Europe. In the kingdoms of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Denmark it was limited to a reform of the Chambers, making the government more representative. It did not spread to either of the extremities of Europe — to Great Britain, the states of the Iberian Peninsula, the Scandinavian states, or the Russian Empire. It assumed a complete form only in France, where

the Provisional Government was compelled by the workers to proclaim the Republic, and then to accept the Socialist formulas of "the right to work" and "national workshops," which alarmed the bourgeoisie and made it hostile to the regime. Republican bourgeois took the place of royalist bourgeois in the Government, and, like the men of 1789, were inspired by humanitarian sentiment. They wished to improve the lot of the people, but did not know how. They allowed the rise of new and democratic means of action, cheap popular newspapers, political clubs and processions, and made all adults join the National Guard. They revolutionized the political system by establishing *universal suffrage* all at once, which increased the number of electors from 240,000 to 9,000,000. Election depended upon the mass of the people, the great majority of which consisted of peasants, totally ignorant of public affairs. The Constitution was framed by a National Assembly elected by universal suffrage, the majority in which was inspired by a humanitarian spirit, but was hostile to the Socialists.

The example of France encouraged opposition parties in other states to make demonstrations, which developed into riots and then into revolutions; for the governments, paralysed by the fear of revolution, conceived as a mysterious power, scarcely put up any resistance. They consented to accept liberal ministers and granted freedom of the press and of assembly. In Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation three elected assemblies were summoned, chosen by indirect universal suffrage, which set to work to draw up liberal constitutions on the model of Belgium. Absolutist systems were everywhere superseded by a government at once liberal, parliamentary, and democratic.

Those disaffected on national grounds were not content with a change of government, but demanded either unity or autonomy. Nationalist passion predominated over other political sentiments because it was more spontaneous and violent, consisting chiefly in an instinctive repulsion for the foreigner. In the Austrian Empire the Hungarian Diet, acting as a constituent assembly, established a system which preserved only personal union with the Emperor. The other nations, Czechs, Croats, Serbs, and Rumanians, who had no organs of government at their disposal, held demonstrations demanding autonomy. In Italy the chief aim of the Revolution was to get rid of

foreign domination. The war against the Austrians was led by the King of Sardinia, who revived the tricolour flag, the Italian national emblem.

The reaction

The Revolution had been carried out by opposition elements united against the Government, but at odds among themselves; and they soon fell out with one another. In France the majority in the Assembly desired to establish a "democratic republic" while maintaining the social system, but was opposed by the minority, which called for a "democratic and social republic" and reforms favourable to the working classes. The former monarchist parties, united under the name of "the party of order," entered into conflict with the workers by obtaining the closing of the "national workshops," which provided a living for unemployed workmen.

In Germany the Assembly was divided as to the form to be given the Government, and still more as to the extent of the territory to be included in the new Federal State. In the Austrian Empire these conflicts led to civil wars between the different nations.

The Revolution had been successful only because it had frightened the governments and taken them by surprise; but the great majority of the ruling classes detested it, and the mass of the peasants remained inert. Monarchy survived, except in France, together with the sovereign, court, officials, and officers. As soon as they had recovered from their panic, they realized the weakness of their opponents and the impotence of the assemblies, and used the army to regain their power and re-establish the former system of government. It was France that set the example. The Assembly conferred the "executive power" on a general, who used troops against the insurgent workers of Paris. The Austrian Government used one of its armies to put down its Italian provinces, and another to recapture Vienna and afterwards to attack the Hungarians, who had revolted against the dynasty. The King of Prussia availed himself of his army to disperse the Assembly and then to crush the democrats who had risen against the German princes. The operation was completed in Italy by a French army which besieged Rome and destroyed the Roman Republic.

As the Revolution was defeated by the army, the Government restored the authoritarian regime. The bourgeoisie rallied to it as a

guarantee of material order, threatened by social revolution, and drew nearer to the clergy, which preached obedience to the people. The governments which had regained their power began by suppressing assemblies and abolishing constitutions and the freedom of the press and of holding meetings which had been granted. They took measures to hinder the spread of ideas of social reform and democratic government. They strengthened the political police, caused the arrest and condemnation of Socialists and democrats, and even placed liberals and free-thinkers under police supervision. They forbade meetings and popular societies and established a censorship over the press or else subjected it to measures of suspension and suppression which placed it at the mercy of the authorities; and they made the schools subject to the supervision of the clergy. In France the reaction took place step by step. Louis Napoleon, who was elected President of the Republic in 1848, formed an authoritarian ministry. The Assembly elected in 1849 had a monarchist majority, which took measures against republicans. In 1851 the President carried out a military *coup d'état*, suppressed the Assembly, and framed a Constitution which gave him the supreme power. He ultimately restored the monarchy under the name of the Empire.

Nevertheless the restoration was not complete, and traces of the Revolution survived in certain innovations: in France universal suffrage, in Italy the liberal Constitution of the kingdom of Sardinia, in Prussia the Constitution of 1850, which created an assembly elected by indirect and unequal suffrage, and in Austria the abolition of forced labour, dues payable by the peasants, and the feudal jurisdiction of the landlords over them. In all those countries in which the agitation had been a national one, memories of the struggle remained, together with the hope of resuming it successfully.

Wars and reforms

Revolution and reaction were followed by a series of four wars between the great powers which led to internal reforms. All these wars had their origin in one of the three monarchies transformed by the Revolution — the French Empire and the kingdoms of Sardinia and Prussia — and the initiative was taken by the heads of the Government: first Napoleon and Cavour, and then Bismarck, who made war in order to carry through an attempt which had failed in 1848. War

between the large states was dreaded by diplomatists, who desired to maintain the existing division of territory and the balance which had been established, as well as by business circles, interested in the maintenance of peace. Except in Prussia the armies were still recruited by voluntary enlistment and conscription and were inadequately prepared for war. Armaments had made but little progress. The percussion musket, which had replaced the flintlock, still took a long time to load and had a short range, and the bronze cannon, which were still muzzle-loaded, discharged cannon-balls or bombs rather than shells. Training consisted of scarcely more than the handling of arms and evolutions on the drill-ground, a bad preparation for manœuvring in open country. Troops marched on foot from place to place, still carrying tents. The officers had received no technical instruction and had had no practical experience of war.

The Prussian army alone was well organized and provided with improved arms, the breech-loading "needle-gun" with central percussion and a steel barrel. It was recruited by compulsory service and allowed no substitutes; but young men who had received a secondary education were allowed to serve for one year only. After three years' service the soldiers entered the reserve (*Landwehr*), which was capable of performing the same service in war as the active army. The officers received systematic instruction in a special school of war, consisting in studying the art of war and training in strategy. Their leaders were imbued with the principle, founded upon Napoleon's campaigns, that war is an instrument of policy and its aim ought not to be the occupation of a position favourable to military operations, but the destruction of the enemy's armed forces so as to impose the victor's will upon him. The Government ought therefore to keep the whole strength of its people in readiness for the moment at which it decides to act, to prepare its plan of action, swiftly mobilize the whole of its forces and reserves by means of rapid transport, and supply the troops in the field by means of requisitions. The measures improvised by revolutionary France and reduced to a system by Prussia gave her the lead over all other states.

A first series of wars was started on the initiative of Napoleon, who succeeded in involving the English Government in a war against Russia for the purpose of defending the Ottoman Empire. It brought him a personal success, the Congress which restored peace being

held in Paris and presided over by France. The defeat of the Russian armies convinced the new Tsar, Alexander II, of the necessity for reforming the system of internal government in his Empire. He started with the enfranchisement of the serfs, allowing them a parcel of land to cultivate on condition of redeeming it by annual payments, the rest of the land remaining in the possession of the noblemen. The power of keeping order exercised by the nobleman was taken from him and transferred to the *mir*, or village community, and to a cantonal tribunal. Alexander next established institutions modelled on those of Europe: courts of law on the French model, with professional judges and a jury for criminal causes, and universities on the German model. He refused to grant a political assembly, but created assemblies elected by the three classes (nobles, towns, and peasants) and in charge of local affairs.

The second war was made by France, in alliance with the kingdom of Sardinia, upon Austria, for the purpose of expelling the Austrians from Italy. It took from her only Lombardy, but was the occasion for national revolts against the princes. Their states were annexed to the kingdom of Sardinia, which became the "Kingdom of Italy" and preserved its liberal Constitution. Italian unity was realized under the form of a central government on the French model, and the army was centralized. Only Venetia and Rome were still needed to complete Italian unity.

The war reacted upon the two great powers engaged in it. The Austrian Government was in need of money, but could no longer raise a loan. To restore his credit the Emperor renounced his absolute power and transformed his Council of Government (*Reichsrat*) into a general assembly of delegates elected from each of the provinces of the Empire by a local assembly (*Landtag*), which was itself elected by four categories of electors. The Austrian Empire assumed the form of a constitutional monarchy.

In France Napoleon had angered both the elements supporting his internal policy — the Catholics by his foreign policy, which had allowed the Italians to deprive the Pope of the greater part of his States, and the great industrialists by concluding a commercial treaty with England, which facilitated the entry of British goods. To find a counterpoise to the opposition of these fresh malcontents, he drew nearer to the liberals, relaxed the repressive measures against the

press, increased the powers of the elected Chamber, and made its sessions public.

The example of Italy stirred up a nationalist agitation in Germany. A "National Union" was created on the Italian model with the object of pressing the Prussian Government to achieve German unity. The new King of Prussia, William, had already put an end to reaction by choosing new ministers. But he desired to strengthen the army by insisting upon three years' service, which had lapsed, and forming new regiments. Finally the elected Chamber (the *Landtag*) refused the credits required for this irregular purpose. The discord between it and the ministers was developing into a theoretical clash of powers between King and Chamber, when Bismarck, who had become Prime Minister, consented to govern and levy the taxes illegally.

The second series of wars began on the initiative of Bismarck, the head of the Prussian Government. He persuaded Austria to join Prussia in making war on the King of Denmark over two duchies with a contested succession, and Denmark was forced to cede them to Austria and Prussia. The two countries fell out over the question of how the duchies were to be governed, and Bismarck found occasion for a war in which Prussia entered into an alliance with Italy against Austria, allied with most of the German princes. It was ended by a rapid invasion and a decisive battle which forced Austria to accept the victor's conditions. Prussia, left in a position to reorganize Germany, annexed those German states whose territories divided her own in two, and compelled the rest to enter a North German Federation. The King of Prussia, with the title of President, was in charge of all its foreign relations, and governed by means of a *Chancellor*, with a Federal Council composed of delegates from the governments of the states, and an Assembly (*Reichstag*) elected by universal suffrage, whose powers were restricted to voting the laws and new taxes.

In Austria the Emperor, after his defeat, gave up imposing his will upon his Magyar subjects and accepted the "Compromise" of 1867, which made the kingdom of Hungary with its dependent territories into a separate state with an aristocratic Constitution and a ministry responsible to the Chambers. The seventeen other provinces received a common liberal Constitution and were represented in the *Reichsrat*. In each of the two states the monarchy was limited by a Constitution and a Parliament with two Chambers.

In France Napoleon, discouraged by his failures in foreign policy, continued to make concessions of a liberal nature and ultimately accepted a responsible ministry formed of deputies belonging to the majority.

Great Britain, which had stood apart from the crises resulting from these wars, was enjoying an economic prosperity which made the workers, combined in a federation of trade unions, strong enough to obtain from Parliament a reform of the electoral system. The lodgers' franchise was granted to workmen living in lodgings; for the first time the English workmen entered political life.

Spain had had crises of her own due to rivalries between generals, and later to conflicts between the generals and the Queen's circle, or *camarilla*. A military revolution led to the flight of the Queen and the summoning of a Constituent Assembly, which preserved the monarchy, but with a responsible ministry and an assembly elected by universal suffrage. The offer of the crown of Spain to a Prussian prince led to a decisive war between France and Prussia, with the German states as its allies. It progressed rapidly, according to the Prussian method, by an invasion of France and the capture of the French armies. It resulted, firstly, in a revolution in Paris, which proclaimed the Republic and set up a Provisional Government of "National defence"; secondly, in the capture of Rome by the Italian army, which put an end to the temporal power of the Pope, and in the proclamation of the German Empire, which was joined by the southern states; and, finally, in a peace with France, which ceded Alsace and part of Lorraine to Germany.

Systems of government and political theories

During these crises certain political practices and theories, expressed by the same terms in all states because they reproduced the same model, were completing their formation in Europe. They were derived from political usages in England and the United States, translated into theory and modified by France and Belgium. The general basis was the *Constitution*, no longer based upon custom, as in England, but drawn up in an official document expressly limiting the powers of the sovereign and guaranteeing the rights of subjects, which were stated in identical terms in most of them.

All the states of Europe except Switzerland were centralized mon-

archies. The hereditary sovereign still retained the power of government, known by jurists as the "executive power," which was, in point of fact, the real, practical power. He exercised it through ministers acting in a council, who had become the real heads of the Government. It was they who appointed to all posts, adopted all practical measures for the maintenance of order, granted subsidies, favours, and exemptions, made regulations, issued decrees, and controlled all foreign relations. They even prepared the business of legislation by drafting bills and the budget. Side by side with the Government, which possessed a prior right, the Constitution established the "legislative power," a system of assemblies on the English model, consisting, everywhere but in the little Balkan States, of two Chambers sitting at the same time and in the same place. A universal rule required that at least one of them, formed of members independent of the Government, and which the sovereign had the power of dissolving, should be elective. The power of the Chambers was confined to discussing, amending, and voting upon bills and taxation, in accordance with the English custom of the *budget*, which determined in advance to what purpose the sums granted to the Government should be allotted.

All assemblies held public sessions and required rules and an organization to guide their debates and keep order. These were everywhere based on the English model, with a president (*speaker*), who intimated to members when they were to speak; a procedure, consisting in the "order of the day," the introduction of a measure, its amendment and putting to the vote, "motions," and "resolutions"; and a system of committees charged with preparing measures and presenting a report.

The electoral system was organized on two different methods. Most states still adhered to the old principle that the vote is a public function reserved to those possessing a stake in the country in the form of real estate. States which had recently adopted a constitutional regime tried to give separate representation to interests of different kinds and had divided electors into a number of categories. Those states which recognized the vote as a right inherent in the capacity of citizen had recently established universal suffrage, an institution which, though revolutionary in origin, was used by the authoritarian governments in France to legitimize the Empire and in Germany to uphold unity as opposed to particularist traditions.

There had thus grown up a sort of constitutional law common to all Europe, having as its essential features limited monarchy and the political liberty of the people, guaranteed by two Chambers which voted the laws and the budget and gave publicity to the acts of the Government. But in practice, under the same official forms these systems of government worked very differently according to the real relations between the sovereign and the ministers, the ministers and Chambers and the Chambers and electors, and according to the extent of the Government's good faith. The states in which ministers chosen by the sovereign were not dependent upon the Chambers were still only "constitutional" monarchies, in which the real power remained in the hands of the sovereign. When ministers were obliged to govern by agreement with the elected Chamber, the system became a parliamentary one (known in England as "responsible"). When the dependence of the deputies upon the electors, or a privileged body of electors, was only slight, the system was an aristocratic one; with universal suffrage it became democratic.

All constitutions recognized the right of the subject to liberty; the laws defined the forms according to which subjects might be arrested and tried. But in case of danger to the State — war, revolt, or riot — the Government reserved the right to suspend the guarantees contained in the Constitution, either on its own authority or with the consent of the Chambers, and exercise absolute power. It might then ban any meeting or newspaper and authorize arrests and trials by exceptional tribunals or military judges, which had power to condemn to death. This exceptional mode of government was used by some governments in bad faith, when no real danger existed, to rid themselves of their opponents or check opposition, especially in the southern states of Europe.

In all states the increasingly complicated affairs of public life required detailed knowledge, practical technique, and persons always on the spot, which the Government could only obtain through a permanent body of professional officials. Even in England, where the central Government had scarcely any save financial agents, a class of officials in the service of the local authorities had been growing up since the institution of elective municipal bodies in the towns. All business was carried on in writing. Information was furnished to the Government by reports and files of papers; its orders were issued

in the form of decrees, regulations, and instructions. The only oral procedure still remaining was that of speeches in the assemblies and pleadings in political trials, which were known to the public only through the newspapers. No personal relations remained any longer between those governing and those governed. Officials alone were in direct touch with the king's subjects, and the real character of a government depended upon their habits. In all countries in which political life was weak (the states of southern and eastern Europe), they accepted bribes for doing their work or, even more, for not applying the rules of their service.

Parties

All states had started from a common principle: the absolute power of the sovereign and his agents; the disagreements among them remained secret and did not take a permanent form. So soon as an assembly was called upon to debate affairs, the disagreement among its members gave rise to public and permanent parties. The deputies and electors grouped themselves according to some preference enunciated in the form of a doctrine; their ideal of government was embodied in certain formulas which proclaimed some sentiment or excited passion. The chief point of contention was the amount of power to be left to the Government (on which depended the extent of the rights recognized as belonging to subjects) or else the extent of the franchise. The absolutist and conservative parties were bent upon keeping power in the hands of the former authorities — the sovereign, officials, aristocracy, and clergy — and had as their formulas social order, authority, the family, and religion. The liberal parties desired innovations that should increase the power of the Assembly and weaken the ancient powers by increasing the scope and rights of subjects; in the name of progress they called for “ministerial responsibility” and “political liberties” — that is, those of speech, the press, meetings, and association. The radicals diverged from the liberals in demanding universal suffrage in the name of democratic equality and of the sovereignty of the people. They were in power only in Switzerland, the only republic in Europe, where they were beginning their experience of new institutions, the *referendum* and the *initiative*, which worked by appealing to the popular vote to adopt, reject, or propose laws. Jurists upheld the theory of the “separation

of powers," but did not perceive that it was contradicted by the responsibility of ministers to the Chambers. These doctrines and formulas were finding their way among a far wider public than in 1848, not only among the bourgeoisie, but among the artisans and urban workers and even some of the peasants, when these had the vote.

Progress in production

Production had been increasing more and more rapidly since Europe had begun working its deposits of coal and metallic ores. The discovery of gold mines in California in 1848 and in Australia in 1851 had immeasurably increased the production of gold, which had risen from an average of 20 to 150 tons per annum. The result was a rapid rise in prices, which had remained almost stable since 1820, and this stimulated production in every department.

Fresh progress took place in agriculture through the use of chemical manures, a recent German invention. But what benefited it most was the railways, which, by making transport cheaper and more rapid, enabled it to sell perishable commodities — cattle, dairy produce, eggs, fowls, and vegetables — in the cities, where the growth in the population increased consumption. The money value of the produce of the soil rose rapidly, and with it the price of land. But this growth in agricultural production was due far more to the opening of markets and the rise in prices than to improvements in technical methods. It depended not so much upon agriculture as upon trade. On the other hand, the industrial crops which had hitherto realized the safest profits in the southern lands were losing their value, owing to the diseases affecting vines and silkworms.

Industry was transformed more thoroughly than agriculture by inventions which did not as yet involve the application of science: the steam-engine, improved methods of producing iron and steel — empiric inventions which dated from earlier than 1848, but had come into far more general use in the industrial regions of Europe — and the construction of railways, which had been very slow before 1848, but was now advancing rapidly. Within a few years Europe became covered with great lines traversing every country and connecting all the large towns. The railways had been organized into limited-liability companies like the great industrial enterprises, with a staff of clerks, mechanics, and workmen paid a wage and subject to discipline.

At the same time, by an almost incredible novelty, the electric telegraph made possible the instantaneous communication of a message from one end of the Continent to the other, and, after the laying of submarine cables, from one continent to another.

Metallurgy was transformed by two inventions: the manufacture of steel by the Bessemer process, and the gas furnace. The production of iron was stimulated by the coming into general use of blast-furnaces heated by coke. These processes provided iron and steel in far larger quantities and at lower prices for rails, locomotives, boilers, steam-engines, and metal girders, which were taking the place of wood in construction.

The extension of metallurgical processes largely increased the consumption of coal and iron ore, and consequently the output of the mines and the number of miners. Machines were increasingly used for the mechanical spinning and weaving of cotton, wool, and linen. This progress was chiefly of benefit to large-scale industry, working with an extensive equipment requiring large capital, and obliged to get together a large number of workmen.

So far this change had taken place only in the industrial regions of England and Belgium and a small part of France and Germany.

Trade and credit

Trade was greatly stimulated by the reduction in the cost of transport due to railways and ships with a screw propeller. Wholesale trade dealt chiefly with goods of which there was a wide consumption: grain, wood, metals, and "colonial produce" (coffee, sugar, and tea, which had come into general use in England). Business transactions were increasingly carried on on the commercial exchanges by means of forward contracts ("futures"), which made it possible to insure against changes of price between the moment of purchase and of sale.

Foreign trade was facilitated by the change of policy adopted by governments, which were beginning to follow the example of England. *Free trade*, expounded by the English as a general theory of trade, benefited by the popularity of the idea of freedom, which was applied to all trade by the "liberal" economists. The commercial treaty concluded with England by Napoleon III abolished all prohibitions and lowered customs duties to the rate of twenty-five per cent of the value

of the goods. Similar treaties were concluded between most states for a term of ten years, which gave purchasers a fixed basis for their calculations. By the "most favoured nation" clause each of the parties to a contract pledged itself not to impose higher duties upon the other than the minimum rate applied to other states. This device, which kept customs dues at a low level, seemed destined to pave the way for a system of free trade.

Retail trade, on the other hand, still adhered to its ancient customs. Its aim was to make the highest possible profit on every sale by bargaining with the customer before fixing the price, according to a practice which is still the custom at cattle and agricultural produce markets, and which made it necessary to sell less and keep things in stock longer. It also retained its habit of granting customers unlimited credit.

Credit had been upset by the sudden inrush of gold from California and Australia and the over-production of silver, resulting from new processes of extraction, which had destroyed the relation between the value of gold and silver established for a thousand years. The enormous mass of currency in circulation made it possible to obtain the necessary capital for railways and large industrial establishments. The sums produced either by saving or from the profits of industry and trade accumulated in the banks, which had become the centres of credit. The State banks, enjoying a privileged position, issued increasing quantities of notes, which took the place of cash in business transactions. The English lessened the requirements for cash and notes and increased the volume of credit by the habit of accepting payment by cheque, even for articles of consumption.

The banks increased the scope of their traditional transactions, which became customary in every land: deposits of money, transfers, loans on the security of goods, and, above all, the discounting of bills and the issue of shares in State loans. A number of private banks survived in provincial towns, where they enjoyed the advantage of being in touch with their clients. But the great credit establishments, which required a very large capital, took the form of limited-liability companies established in the capitals, and founded branches in other towns. A few, following the example of Scotland, used the money deposited by their clients for making long-term loans to great indus-

trial concerns, especially for the construction of railways or for gas companies.

Enterprises requiring a large capital — mining, large-scale metallurgical industries, shipping lines, railways, chemical industries, and some of the textile industries, organized themselves into limited-liability companies, or corporations, and issued *shares*, or stock, giving the right to a variable dividend, and debentures, or bonds, bearing a fixed interest and redeemable at a fixed date. The stock exchanges, or bourses, on which these securities were negotiated, now became great centres of speculation, where fortunes were made and unmade with a rapidity regarded as scandalous. The most important of them developed into international money-markets, where the poorer countries came to borrow from the richer ones. London, which, thanks to its port, had become the greatest commercial centre in the world, was also the largest reservoir of capital and credit for State loans and foreign enterprises.

Population

The population in Europe was increasing more rapidly than before, especially as a result of the surplus of births, for the birth-rate was still very high both in eastern Europe, which was still poor and agricultural, and in the regions of large-scale industry, peopled by wage-earning workers. In France alone, by an exception which seemed abnormal at that time, since the large majority of her population was rural and agricultural, the birth-rate was falling, while wealth and comfort were unquestionably increasing. Economists, in accordance with the general belief, had assumed that the number of children would increase with the facilities for feeding them. But, on the contrary, it was noticed that the highest birth-rate was to be found among the wretched populations of eastern and southern Europe, and, in Great Britain and France, in the poorest families, those of agricultural labourers and badly paid workers. The birth-rate was lowest in the richest quarters of the large towns and in the most well-to-do families. It was impossible to avoid the conclusion that the low birth-rate was not due to inability to feed children, but had a connection with comfort, which made people desire to have fewer children, so as to maintain them on the same social level as their parents. The

low birth-rate was the result of voluntary limitation and had no relation to the quantity of supplies.

The population increased far more rapidly in the towns, especially as a result of the migration to them of workers from the country. The increase in the population of towns having more than a hundred thousand inhabitants has been estimated at twenty-five per cent for Europe as a whole and thirty-four per cent in western Europe. The population was beginning to overflow the bounds of Europe, and after 1848 emigration became very considerable, especially from Great Britain (with Ireland) and Germany to the United States, and, to some extent, to South America.

Society

Society had been modified both by the changes in political life, especially in the backward states of eastern Europe, and by material ones resulting from the progress of technical methods and trade. In eastern Europe inequality before the law was removed in Austria and Hungary by the abolition of feudal dues and in Russia by the abolition of serfdom. The effect was to equalize conditions before the law. Equality was also granted to the Jews, who were granted in principle treatment in accordance with the common law. Inequality persisted in the conditions of real life, in wealth, education, and social consideration. It was still shown in costume, speech, and manners.

The great mass of the people was still composed of manual labourers, still consisting chiefly of peasants and agricultural labourers. In eastern Europe their position before the law had risen without greatly improving their mode of life. In Russia the serfs, having gained their freedom and the ownership of a parcel of land, were still burdened with heavy charges for compensation. In the central region they had received only a piece of land of less than two acres on the average, which was insufficient to support their family, and they had to go and look for work at a distance as craftsmen or workmen. In Poland, East Prussia, and Austria most of them were still day-labourers settled on the domain of a great landowner.

In western Europe their position had been improved by the rise in agricultural prices and the ease of transport, but the peasant farmer had not enjoyed all the profit, for landlords had raised rents, and the peasant proprietor was often still loaded with debts, on which

Small shopkeepers and employees still had a rather higher standard of living than artisans, and their social status was improving for the same reasons and in the same proportion. But their life had not changed much. They did not travel, hardly read at all, and enjoyed none but the traditional amusements of the masses — weddings, the carnival, performances at fairs, and the festivals of the local saint.

It was the middle class that benefited most by technical progress, the increase in the profits of industry, trade, and banking, for it was the bourgeois who filled the professions of employer, merchant, and banker. The increase of wealth was indirectly advantageous to the "liberal professions," lawyers, doctors, men of letters, and professors, who increased in number and obtained higher salaries. Those bourgeois who owned estates profited by the higher rents for farms and prices of land; those who possessed money or securities found opportunities for increasing their fortune by speculation, and, still more, for increasing their income by investing their money in shares or State loans.

The nobility was still the highest class in all the countries of eastern Europe, where the distinction persisted between noblemen owning very great domains and the lesser nobility, whose position had deteriorated owing to the abolition of feudal dues in Austria and to that of serfdom in Russia. The nobles still held the bourgeois at arm's length, but the bankers were succeeding in insinuating themselves into high society.

In western Europe, and even in Austria, the difference between nobility and wealth was becoming less marked, and in England the rich man was becoming confounded with the nobleman, provided that he led the same kind of country life. On the Continent the nobles were still separated from other classes by their traditional repugnance for following any profession or holding any office except in the army or diplomacy. Thus they renounced all share in the general increase of wealth, except for those great nobles who maintained their fortunes by marriage with heiresses of bourgeois origin.

Increased plenty and greater ease of transport gave the bourgeoisie and nobility a fuller life. Their consumption of luxurious garments, fine linen, furniture, and works of art increased. Progress in printing and the fall in prices made the reading of books, reviews,

and newspapers more general. Photography, a recent invention, began to provide an abundance of portraits giving an exact likeness. The custom became more widespread of taking holidays at watering-places or the seaside, and travelling for pleasure to the mountains or to art-centres, even abroad. Amusements were growing more varied and frequent, including especially the theatre, concerts, balls, evening parties, and games of chance, organized in public gaming-establishments at fashionable resorts. Costume followed the English fashion for men and the French fashion for women. Those were the days of the crinoline and the chignon of false hair.

Women remained subject to the authority of men and dependent upon their father or husband, both economically and in law, having no independent means of existence, except in the case of rich widows. Among the masses the women kept house and shared in the man's labour, but even the working woman's wages were the property of the man. In noble or bourgeois families the housework was done by servants, and the woman was supported by her parents or husband, but had nothing at her own disposal, not even the income from her own personal fortune. She was not admitted to any profession except those of private governess or housekeeper. In this state of dependence it was difficult for her to resist the pressure of her parents in the choice of a husband.

Intellectual life

The most profound intellectual reactions were produced by the marked progress in the sciences, due to a few men who had made science their exclusive profession. Most of these were professors at a university or establishment for some special branch of higher education. They worked according to common methods of scientific research, without troubling about the practical applications of their discoveries. Progress was going on simultaneously in physics, through the theory of the equivalence of forces (motion, heat, electricity, magnetism, light) and the method of spectrum analysis, invented in Germany, which demonstrated the unity of composition of all the heavenly bodies in the universe; in chemistry, by the development of the atomic theory and the synthesis of organic bodies; in biology, at once by vivisection, which made it possible to analyse the working of

the organs, and by the discovery of ferments and microbes, which revealed the unity of the phenomena of vegetable and animal life; and in zoology, by the theory of evolution.

The rapprochement between the various sciences led to the idea that all phenomena were produced in a settled order, of like nature for all. All the sciences were reduced to a uniform plan by the classification formulated by Auguste Comte as the basis of "positivism," which reduced all knowledge to the "positive" knowledge acquired by observation of the phenomena accessible to the senses. This tendency, when carried to extremes, led to materialism, which would admit of the study of none but material phenomena. An English positivist, Herbert Spencer, amended the theory by the idea of the "unknowable," admitting that there is a part of reality which man has no means of knowing.

The progress of the sciences discredited metaphysics and led philosophers to turn towards the logic of the scientists and the history of their theories, and afterwards to psychology, which they tried to treat experimentally. The study of social phenomena (languages, religion, law, and the arts) increasingly took the form of inquiring into their past history, on the historical method, in the form of "special" histories. This was especially so in Germany.

The facts recorded by the natural sciences and the history of humanity appeared to be in contradiction with the conception of the world and the historic narratives taught in the name of revelation by the representatives of religion. The opposition between these two methods took the popular form of a "conflict" between religion and science. It was concerned especially with the origin of man and sometimes became confused with the conflict between deists and materialists over the existence of the soul. These opposing conceptions were disseminated by different methods. Religious doctrines were spread abroad by the teaching of the catechism to children, the preaching of sermons against subversive doctrines, religious instruction, and the compulsory practice of religion in the schools. The clergy, especially in the Catholic countries, supplemented these by new methods — newspapers, lectures, and pilgrimages organized by ecclesiastics.

The new ideas hardly found their way at all into the primary schools, which had remained under the supervision of ministers of religion, or even into secondary establishments (the French *col-*

lège, the German *Gymnasium*, or the English grammar-school), in which education was practically confined to Latin and mathematics. Natural science and history only appeared in these as subsidiary subjects and in an antiquated form. Teaching had only become free from the influence of the clergy in the universities and higher specialized schools, where men of learning worked and the professors, being in personal contact with the students, were able to express ideas opposed to tradition. These conceptions, arising out of the use of scientific methods, were still confined to the world of higher education. But by means of controversies, newspapers, and lectures they were beginning to reach part of the urban population in the distorted form, adapted to popular sentiment, of vulgar denials of ancient beliefs.

The most salient fact in æsthetic life during this short period was *realism*, based on a theory having its origin in literature and applied to the plastic arts. The "realists," in their reaction against Romanticism, claimed to give an exact representation of reality. They were led to draw attention for preference to its painful or unpleasant aspects. Lyrical poetry was going out of fashion and the novel of contemporary manners was becoming the most productive type of literature. Painting drew its subjects more and more from landscape or everyday life. Music, torn between the influence of Germany and of Italy, worked principally at opera or *opéra bouffe*. The works of Wagner, which raised much controversy in Germany, had not yet reached the public.

THE LONG PEACE AND CHANGED CONDITIONS OF LIFE

●

Internal politics

The interval between the end of the wars of 1871 and the World War in 1914 was an unprecedentedly long period of general peace, coinciding with a profound evolution in the conditions of life.

A number of new conditions worked together to provide governments with irresistible force for repressing all attempts at armed revolution. New firearms, the quick-firing rifle and the machine-gun, much greater armies and police forces, the telegraph and the telephone, enabled them to foresee and put down all attacks. Their superior strength was so obvious that after the Paris Commune no revolution took place in Europe.

The political system changed, but only by peaceful evolution, proceeding at a more rapid pace in the twentieth century and resulting mainly from the reaction of the Chambers upon the Government, and the electors upon the Chambers, which took the form of party strife. Till then the parties had been organized only inside the Chambers, the electors being called upon to group themselves together at elections only. It was the Liberal party in England that, following the example of the United States, set the example of a permanent organization of electors. A central committee, consisting of delegates from local committees, was charged with raising funds for the party cause, financing party newspapers, drafting the party program in terms calculated to arouse feeling, and carrying on propaganda for recruiting adherents and inducing electors to vote. This process was imitated in every country and gave the parties a constant influence in politics.

But though the same names were given to institutions or adopted by parties, the actual practice differed greatly. In the southern states the Government was to all outward appearance a parliamentary one, the majority party forming the ministry. In some of them — in Rumania after the Constitution of 1866, in Spain after the restoration of the monarchy, in Portugal, and for a time in Serbia and Bulgaria — “conservatives” and “liberals” even took office alternately, as in England. But in all these countries the mass of the electors, poor, ignorant, and indifferent to public affairs, suffered the elections to be held under Government pressure, very often by fraud or violence. To form a ministry, the sovereign had only to call upon whichever party leader he desired to use as an instrument, and dissolve the Chamber; the new minister controlled the elections and obtained a majority. In every state the parliamentary system became a sham, behind which the power of the sovereign still survived. In Hungary alone was he obliged to have a ministry responsible to the elected Chamber, the enormous majority in which was made up of Magyar nobles.

In the eastern and northern states, where the people, being more prosperous, better educated, and accustomed to taking an interest in public life, actively participated in the elections, the practice of government was brought more and more into line with parliamentary theory by becoming more and more democratic, the ministers representing the party with a majority in the elected Chamber. But the English practice, elevated into a theory by the jurists, allowed for two parties only, succeeding each other in power according as the will of the electors gave the majority to one or the other of them. This could no longer survive when the political world became divided into more than two parties. In Great Britain this first happened when the new Irish party, founded to demand autonomy, succeeded in preventing either of the two English parties from obtaining a majority; and again, later, after the foundation of a Labour party with an independent organization. In Belgium it happened when the new Labour party opposed both the Catholics and the liberals. In France the Republican party was first formed in the National Assembly by three groups in opposition to the monarchist groups which had formed a coalition under the name of *Conservatives*. It adopted a compromise by which a parliamentary system of an unprecedented character

was established: a Republic, with a Chamber elected by universal suffrage, a Senate, and a President elected for seven years. It soon obtained a majority and formed a government. Later it was split up by the secession of dissentient members, who once more adopted the name of *Radicals*, and the Chamber remained divided into three parties, none of them commanding a safe majority.

In all states those engaged in politics tended to split up into an increasing number of groups. No party could now command a majority, and, to obtain a majority which could assume the government, it was necessary, in violation of theory, to unite several parties in a coalition. But since different coalitions were possible, it became necessary to start by choosing among them. The head of the State chose who was to form the ministry and combine the groups necessary for obtaining a majority. The same group might enter several combinations in succession. Since these coalitions readily dissolved, ministries lasted a very short time, except in Great Britain, where the coalitions were strong.

In the three Scandinavian states the parties were formed on a system the reverse of that in other states, in which the conservative party was recruited in the country and its opponents in the large towns. Here, on the contrary, the conservatives were elected by the capital, and the democrats by the peasants. In all three countries the opposition, after a long resistance, at last compelled the king to consent to the establishment of the parliamentary system. By the aid of a national movement, they even succeeded in separating Norway from Sweden and organizing it into an independent kingdom.

In the empires the real power was still in the hands of the sovereign, governing through the officials and the hereditary aristocracy, in Austria under the semblance of a parliamentary system, in Germany under the form of a constitutional monarchy with ministers chosen by the sovereign and independent of the Chambers, and an assembly democratic in appearance, but with no power beyond that of voting the laws and new taxation asked for by the Government; in Prussia and the German states with a similar system there were ministers who were the prince's officials, and Chambers with limited powers.

The Russian Empire continued to be an absolute monarchy, with neither a constitution nor a political assembly, and governed by of-

ficials with the aid of a secret police armed with discretionary powers, which was able to arrest or send to Siberia any subject suspected of liberal opinions. Democratic opposition took the form of secret propaganda among the peasants and workmen, but later, in response to repressive measures, it created a terrorist "militant organization" working by means of assassinations, which culminated in the murder of the Emperor, Alexander II. His successor stiffened the absolutist system by measures of repression, a censorship of foreign books, and the creation of a new police.

International parties

Political life was complicated by the activities of parties of an international character. The activities of the Catholics were directed towards increasing the influence of the Church over the Government. In some countries they worked with the conservative party. In Switzerland, Austria, and Germany they formed a separate one. A common leadership was provided by the Pope, as sole head of the Church. In 1864 Pius IX had begun the conflict between the Church and the modern State system by solemn acts, and in particular by the *Syllabus*, or summary of condemned doctrines. He condemned freedom of worship and of the press, secular education, civil marriage, and "modern civilization," and demanded for the clergy the regime of the Middle Ages — official authority over believers and complete independence of the State. His successor, while maintaining the same doctrine, tried to come to an understanding with the governments by holding out to them a prospect of support from the Catholic party in their country in exchange for an increase in the influence of the clergy.

The first concerted action between Socialists in the different countries took the form of the "International Labour Association," founded in London in 1864 by English workmen and exiles, but after holding a few international congresses it broke up. The first party to proclaim its international character was founded in Germany and took the name of *Social Democrat*, borrowed from the France of 1848. Its program consisted of three parts: an exposition of its theoretical basis — the doctrine of Karl Marx; a list of the conditions necessary for carrying out its plan of "social revolution"; and an enumeration of the political reforms to be obtained in order to prepare the way for it. It represented social revolution not as a battle against the Govern-

ment, as the Socialists of 1848 had done, but as the inevitable result of the evolution of the present industrial system, which was bound to end by turning the whole mass of workers into "proletarians." It based its forecasts on the theories of political economy, thus giving its doctrines the prestige of science, which was already great in the eyes of the workers. The future course of the party was summed up in four formulas: "organization of the proletariat into a class party" in conflict with all other parties, which were called "bourgeois" (even the Radical party); an international understanding between the proletariats of all countries; the "conquest of political power," either legally, by obtaining a majority, or by a violent revolution against "capitalist" society; and the "socialization of all means of production," including the land, which implied the abolition of property and private trade. By heralding the revolution without appointing a precise date, this theory gave its adherents both the assurance that it would take place and the hope of soon seeing it realized inevitably through the evolution of the capitalist system. It appealed to a sentiment of revolutionary hope, analogous to the religious sentiment of faith in a future life.

The Socialist party entered the political party conflict by putting forward candidates as a means of propaganda among the electors, to collect votes rather than to obtain the return of members. It created a permanent organization with a committee at its head, collected subscriptions from its adherents, and had its own funds and press organ. It provided a model for the similar parties created in almost every state, with the same program, the same forms of propaganda, and frequently the same organization.

England and France, where Socialism had taken its rise before 1848 and found its formulas and practical aims, created less strictly disciplined parties which were more independent of the theoretical doctrine: in Great Britain the "Labour party," founded by the Trade Union Federation to call for gradual practical reforms without a revolution; in France a number of rival groups having nothing in common but the desire for a change in the social system. In 1893 these ultimately combined to form a Confederation for purposes of the elections.

In 1889, on the initiative of the Belgian Labour party, Socialists of different lands united in the second "Workers' International,"

organized in a federation, which held an International Congress of delegates at long intervals, passed "resolutions" in common, and appointed a permanent committee. Each party retained its independence and determined its own line of conduct in home politics, but after the Socialist parties in all states had joined the International, the Congress of 1903 imposed uniform tactics upon them all, on the initiative of the Germans, compelling them to form a "class party" with a view to social revolution and not to enter into an alliance with any of the "bourgeois" parties.

Agitation and crises

In the empires, where the small nations were subject to one foreign to them, they became increasingly conscious of the difference of sentiment and interest between them and their Government. They carried on a more active opposition, which determined the governments to adopt more oppressive measures for "denationalizing" them, especially by forcing them to change their language. A zone of oppressed and discontented *nationalities* came into being, extending across Europe from the Arctic to the Mediterranean: the Finns, Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, and Poles of the Russian Empire, the Czechs, Ruthenes, Slovaks, Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs subject to the governments of Vienna and Budapest, and the Serbs, Bulgars, Macedonians, and Greeks subject to the Sultan, besides the Poles and Danes annexed to the German Empire. They complained of being deprived of means of instruction in their mother tongue, kept out of almost all forms of employment, reduced to an inferior social status, and often of being persecuted for their fidelity to their language or religion. Most of them demanded only autonomy, and especially churches and schools in which their own language should be used, so that they might obtain the diplomas necessary to give them access to public employment.

By the beginning of the twentieth century the political conflicts became more acute, and in most states even critical. In Great Britain the coalition between three parties (Liberal, Labour, and Irish), which obtained control of the Government in 1905, came into conflict with the Conservative party, carried out radical reforms, and weakened the power of the House of Lords. In France the Radical party, having formed a coalition with the Socialists, expelled the unauthorized Con-

gregations and ended by separating Church and State. In Portugal the King, who had supported an absolutist dictatorship, was assassinated, and a military revolt under his successor established an anti-clerical Republic. In Austria, where the obstruction carried on by the Czech national party had long impeded the working of Parliament, the Emperor established universal suffrage in 1906 to weaken the national parties, thereby strengthening the popular ones, the Socialists and Catholics, and upsetting the party balance. In Hungary the Magyar nationalist party, in alliance with the Slav malcontents, came into conflict with the King-Emperor over the army question. In Russia the Government was so much weakened by defeat in the war with Japan that the Tsar, alarmed by a general strike, consented to a political assembly for the whole Empire, which came into acute conflict with the ministers. The revolts of workmen and peasants and the agitation and occasional risings in the regions with a non-Russian population produced the impression of a revolution. The Government crushed all these movements at last and obtained a majority by a change in the electoral system; and the Russian Empire remained a semi-absolute monarchy, though with an elected assembly using the modern forms.

Political life among the little peoples of the Balkans was troubled by acts of violence. In Serbia the officers massacred the King, who had turned absolutist, and recalled the head of a rival dynasty, who gave the power to the nationalist Radical party. In Greece the personal government of the King was abolished by the revolt of the "League of Officers," who placed a Cretan patriot, the leader of the Liberal party, in power to reorganize the system of government. In Bulgaria the prince stirred up strife between the leaders of rival coteries and proclaimed himself Tsar, independent of the Sultan. In Macedonia the Christian population which had remained subject to the Sultan carried out an insurrection with the aid of armed exiles sent in by a committee working in Bulgaria.

Character of this evolution

In the main, the political system of the states evolved in a liberal, parliamentary; and democratic direction. Governments had grown accustomed to granting more freedom to their opponents in respect of newspapers, meetings, and public demonstrations. Ministers were growing more submissive to the will of the majority in the elected

Chamber. The franchise had been greatly extended. In Spain and Belgium it had become universal all at once, in the Scandinavian and Balkan states, the smaller German states, and Austria it became so gradually, and in Italy by 1913. Switzerland, and afterwards Belgium, had tried the experiment of a system based on theory — proportional representation — which was adopted so as not to leave minorities unrepresented, and turned the personal mandataries of the electors into delegates of the parties, chosen by their committees.

While the personal power of governments was being weakened by the resistance of the Chambers and electors, the impersonal power of the State was growing stronger. It allowed its subjects much more liberty in their political life and private conduct and the expression of their ideas, but interfered far more in their economic life, firstly by regulating the hours and conditions of industrial labour by legislation, inspection, and insurance against sickness, industrial accidents, and old age, and secondly by taking upon itself many forms of expenditure for the benefit of the masses — relief to the poor and aged, hospitals, elementary schools, roads, public parks, water-supply, street-lighting, street-cleaning, and cheap housing. To meet its expenditure on these services and on armaments, the State dealt increasingly heavy blows at private property, by imposing heavier taxation upon real estate, inheritance, and securities. It had ceased to debase the currency, which, following the example of England, had come more and more to be based on the gold standard. When taxation was insufficient for its needs, it met the deficit by a loan, often subscribed for abroad. The practice in this respect differed widely. Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and the Scandinavian states balanced their budgets, and increased their debt very little, or even provided for its redemption by a sinking fund. The other countries had an almost permanent deficit and allowed their debt to mount up. The largest of these, that of France, which rose in 1913 to 33,000,000,000 francs, had been facilitated by the saving habits of the French.

Political life was growing milder. Only in eastern Europe, in Russia and the Balkan States, did governments still imprison their opponents, ill-treat them, or put them to death and allow the police to torture political prisoners so as to extort a confession. Elsewhere the execution of political offenders had ceased, political trials were conducted in due form, and press trials became infrequent. The “op-

ponents of the Government" were not molested. Refugees from foreign countries were admitted and even allowed to settle down, and their extradition was almost always refused. Political life had grown more humane.

External politics

No war was now going on in Europe, except in what had once been the Ottoman Empire. The relations between states now consisted only in negotiations and treaties. The impression left by the victories of Prussia had changed people's conception of war. Instead of frontier operations between professional armies, it was the invasion of a country by an armed people, upsetting the life of the whole nation. This it was the Government's duty to avoid; but the people was bound to provide it with the forces to repel invasion. Rapid mobilization and progress in arms of offence — quick-firing artillery, explosive shells, and machine-guns — gave such a crushing superiority to the army which was ready first that no government could now wait for the opening of hostilities before getting its forces ready. It had to keep its troops and material of war always prepared for immediate action, and required a great mass of men. Two states only, England and Spain, did not feel themselves threatened, and so preserved the old system of recruiting; the former had a small army of volunteers, and the latter only called up part of those liable for service. All other states had established compulsory service on the Prussian model, with a shorter period for those attending secondary schools, and maintained a *reserve*, in readiness to supplement the active army. The army became a school of preparation for war. Since the rapid progress in the engines of war made it necessary to renew armaments frequently, expenditure became almost as heavy in times of peace as it had formerly been in times of war. This state of affairs, known as the "armed peace," maintained peace, but with the burdens of war.

The superior strength of the German army had upset the balance between the great powers, giving the preponderance to the German Empire. Bismarck, who directed its policy, sought to maintain this preponderance without fresh acquisitions of territory. He worked to prevent the other states from forming a coalition against Germany. It was impossible, however, to maintain the *status quo* in the Balkan Peninsula, where the Christian nations wished to free themselves from

Ottoman domination. It was broken by a revolt of the Serbs, involving the Russian Empire in a war that resulted in a partial dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The principalities of Rumania and Serbia were turned into independent kingdoms, part of the Bulgarian territory was made into a principality, and Austria received the administration of Bosnia, which led it to extend its action in the Balkan Peninsula.

Commercial relations between the states which were evolving in the direction of free trade tendered to revert to the protectionist system in order to satisfy not only industrialists but also agriculturists, alarmed by the competition of lands outside Europe. Governments set up tariffs of import duties which rose higher and higher. Great Britain alone still adhered to free trade, which had become a doctrine of the Liberal party.

The relations between states gradually changed as a new balance became established. Germany concluded an alliance first with Austria and then with Italy, but did not break with Russia. The three empires continued to be bound by a treaty signed in 1891 and kept strictly secret. After the crisis in the Ottoman Empire these relations were complicated by events outside Europe. Certain states adopted a "policy of expansion," which has been called "imperialism." Through a series of negotiations and small military expeditions they would acquire a colonial Empire, by either establishing a "protectorate" or obtaining the recognition by other states of a "sphere of influence." Almost the whole of Africa was divided up between Great Britain and France, and Russian domination extended over the whole of northern Asia. Having become rivals outside Europe as a result of the competition between them, the three "imperialist" powers now seemed isolated in face of the *Triple Alliance* of the central European states.

This system of relations, maintained by Bismarck, was abandoned by William II, who refused to renew the treaty with Russia. This displeased the Tsar, Alexander III, and he drew closer to France, whose aid he required for the loans necessary to Russian industry. He decided to conclude a defensive agreement with the French Government, thus giving France the impression that she was no longer isolated. Converted to the "policy of expansion" and desiring to give Germany an active part in "world politics," William created

a navy, which began to cause the English anxiety. He encouraged the new Tsar, Nicholas II, to engage in a policy of expansion in the Far East, which disquieted the Japanese and distracted the Russians from the Balkan Peninsula, where Austria increased its influence over the Christian states. The ensuing Russo-Japanese War, which ended in the victory of Japan, weakened the position of Russia.

The English Government, uneasy at Germany's doings, decided to abandon its isolation. It first effected a rapprochement with France, by a Convention settling all matters in dispute between the two states, and afterwards with Russia, by a similar Convention concerning Asia. Thus was consummated the "Triple Entente," which appeared as a counterpoise to the Triple Alliance. It gave Germany the impression that she was threatened by "encirclement," especially after the Triple Alliance was weakened by a conflict between Austria and Italy over the Balkan States. The attempt which was twice made by a Congress of all the states in the world (in 1899 and 1907) to strengthen the prospects of peace through a limitation of armaments led to no more than aspirations and the creation of a court of arbitration, which was, however, optional.

The peace of Europe was destroyed as the result of an internal crisis in the Ottoman Empire — the revolt of the Macedonian army against the Sultan. The Austrian Government took advantage of this to annex Bosnia, and the Prince of Bulgaria to proclaim his sovereignty. The Ottoman Empire, weakened by internal conflicts, seemed incapable of defending itself. Italy made war upon it to acquire Libya; after which the little Balkan States attacked it with the object of annexing the lands with a Christian population and conquered almost the whole of its territory in Europe. The disturbance resulting from these crises was to lead to the European catastrophe.

New conditions of material life

The change in the material conditions of life was so rapid and profound as to give the impression of a revolution. It took place on the same lines in every country in Europe, as the result of two causes acting independently upon every form of economic life. Technical progress was achieved through the application of science, which took the place of the old empiric inventions made without any precise preliminary calculation of the desired results. The sciences based upon

methods of exact measurement and mathematical calculation gave rise to general laws applicable even to the future, making it possible to foresee exactly what results were to be expected from every operation and devise in advance the process that would produce the desired effect. Henceforward the work of technical invention was preceded by theoretical research conducted in scientific or educational establishments, with the purely scientific intention of determining the laws affecting phenomena; or else by experiments in technical processes carried out in the laboratories attached to great industrial concerns and, for agriculture, at experimental stations. These researches provided the means of increasing the quantity of available force at the service of industry, and even of inventing artificial substances possessing the exact qualities required for some predetermined purpose.

The rapid increase in production was due to a fundamental change in the materials employed. All down the ages almost the whole of these had been provided either by living plant and animal substances, renewed by slow growth, or else by mineral substances of which there were unlimited supplies (stone, clay, sand, lime, plaster, salt, iron ore); and almost all of these had been obtained entirely locally or from some European country. The European peoples now began to take advantage of the ease and low price of transport to import from the great lands outside Europe, hitherto unpeopled or little cultivated, enormous quantities of produce: wheat, wool, cotton, meat and skins, wood, and indiarubber. In future most raw materials were obtained by exploiting the mineral treasures accumulated during thousands of centuries. This provided industry with metallic ores (iron, copper, lead, silver, mercury, nickel, manganese, and aluminum) and fuel (coal and petroleum), and agriculture with deposits of phosphates, nitrates, and potash. The material resources of regions which had remained unpopulated were exploited in such a way as rapidly to exhaust them. Forests were felled to provide wood-pulp for paper. The vegetable mould accumulated by the rotting vegetation of the Russian steppes and American prairies was exploited for wheat production without the addition of fertilizers and rapidly exhausted. The unprecedented wealth enjoyed by Europe today was acquired by squandering the treasures of the whole earth. After the opening of the mines in South Africa, gold had an exceptional position in this process of exploitation, the total supply having been quadrupled between 1850

and 1910. The abundance of gold seems to have had as its consequence that prices remained almost stable since the middle of the century, in spite of the enormous increase in production which tended to lower them.

The revolution in production

Agriculture increased its production, largely thanks to chemical manures, which increased crops to an unprecedented degree. The scientific study of heredity made it possible to produce beasts of superior weight and quality by the selection of breeding-animals, and that of plants facilitated the selection and hybridization of seeds, which produced new and more productive varieties with a greater resistance to weather and disease. Agriculture also benefited by the progress in the metal industries to replace the old wooden implements by metal ones and obtain agricultural machinery (mowing-machines, reapers, threshing-machines, sowing-drills, and metal tools), thus considerably reducing the amount of labour required.

Progress in transport made it possible to sell perishable produce — meat, dairy produce, eggs, vegetables, fruit, and flowers — in the great urban markets. Having become far more dependent upon commerce, agriculture now produced far less for the consumption of the grower and the local market, and far more for sale either through the agency of wholesale merchants, or to great industrial establishments (distilleries, sugar-refineries, cheese, butter- and jam-factories, oil-refineries, and milling-plants). The producer tended to specialize in a single kind of crop or beasts, raised for the wholesale market. The traditional occupation of wheat-growing went through a severe crisis, prices falling as a result of the competition of grain imported from new countries outside Europe, where production was cheap. It was ruined in England, where the bulk of the foodstuffs was henceforth provided by importation. The competition of these new countries also caused a fall in the prices of the chief agricultural products — wine and oil, wool and skins, linen and hemp.

Industrial production was even more profoundly revolutionized as it increased its production by means of applied science. This transformed both the industries employed in extracting raw materials and manufacturing plant for other industries (machines, apparatus, constructional material, and tools) and, at the same time, those manu-

facturing articles intended directly for the consumption of the public. The change was a radical one in the "heavy" industries, which availed themselves of unlimited forces set in action by the application of mechanics, physics, and chemistry and by the mining of metallic ores, fuel, and deposits of natural fertilizers. Large-scale metallurgy was transformed by the use of alloys, the electric furnace, and the English process (invented by Thomas) which made it possible to utilize iron ore containing phosphorus. As water-power was transformed into electrical power, electricity ousted steam in mining, metallurgy, railway transport, lighting, and heating.

Applied chemistry was used chiefly in the industries producing goods for ordinary consumption. The new processes of distillation provided far larger quantities of spirits, which had come into general use. The distillation of coal produced illuminating gas, and its by-products transformed the dyeing and perfumery industries. The distillation of petroleum provided a new source of light to replace oil lamps. Applied chemistry produced cinematography, synthetic drugs, and wood-pulp, which made the mass production of newspapers possible. It transformed tanning, laundry-work, and sugar-manufacture and created the cold-storage industry.

The invention of the internal-combustion engine created the motor-vessel, the automobile, and the airplane. The electric telegraph was supplemented by the invention of the telephone, the discovery of Hertzian waves gave birth to wireless telegraphy and afterwards to radiophony. The invention of the submarine completed the realization of man's dreams of flying through the air, navigating under water, and talking between the ends of the earth.

Trade

Trade was enabled to bring wares from the most distant lands at far lower prices, especially by sea: wheat, wool, cotton, hemp, hides, ores, metals, coal, petroleum, and colonial produce (sugar, tea, cocoa, tobacco, and, above all, coffee), which, in the towns at least, had become articles of general consumption.

Retail trade was transformed by the foundation in the great cities of big stores dealing in articles hitherto sold in different shops. These introduced new methods into trade based upon the principle of "small profits and quick returns" and of cash sales, the wares being dis-

played in profusion to tempt customers and ticketed with fixed prices. These methods accustomed the public to buying without haggling and forced retailers to lower their prices.

Credit

Money-markets were revolutionized by the wider use of credit. Banking transactions were carried out more and more by large concerns with a very big capital. The spare funds of commercial or industrial houses and private savings were deposited with them and used in the banking business. The banks helped to float State loans by inducing their clients to subscribe to them. The State banks issued increasing quantities of notes payable at sight and backed by a gold reserve equivalent to only part of the value of the note issue. Hence the amount of fiduciary paper currency greatly exceeded the real money. It was further increased by the more and more general use of cheques secured on the payer's bank deposit and by the operations of *clearing-houses* on the English model. The English made a far wider use of the cheque, the French of bank-notes. The chief object of the latter was to secure a regular income by investing their money in French Government securities, whereas the English and Germans preferred to invest them in businesses which took greater risks but earned higher profits. The ancient banking countries, Switzerland and Holland, continued to carry out large transactions abroad. The other states, which were less rich, drew part of their capital from the countries of western Europe.

Transport, industrial and commercial enterprises required an enormous capital, which could only be accumulated by limited liability companies, using the funds subscribed by their shareholders. The banks carried on their transactions not so much with the capital subscribed by their shareholders as with the money deposited with them and belonging to the depositors. Yet the amount of gold and silver in circulation sufficed, for requirements were confined to the payment of wages and retail purchases and to settling the balance of indebtedness between one country and another. The whole system was based upon *credit*, a word signifying confidence—confidence that notes would always be convertible into gold, and that the interest on loans would always be paid. This was justified by experience. As a matter of fact, notes were always accepted at their face value, which

remained the same in all states in which economic life was normal, so that the exchanges remained at par, with very slight variations. Even in states where credit was less stable (Russia, Austria, and Spain), the variation in the exchange hardly exceeded twenty-five per cent. States and cities, with rare exceptions, paid the interest on their debt. Shares in loans were usually to be purchased at the rate of issue, or even at a premium, and, in states with a low exchange, at a small discount only. Credit remained stable because the public was accustomed to the stability of fiduciary currencies, the exchanges, and securities in general.

Legally, every business was controlled by its owners and independent of any other, as in the days when each business was owned by an individual. In point of fact the shareholders, its legal owners, and the bondholders, its legal creditors, no longer possessed any real power, for the shares were scattered among a large number of holders or deposited in banks. The obligatory annual meeting of shareholders became a mere formality and failed to exercise any real control, only a small minority of them attending it. The directors, though legally only the paid agents of the company, had become the real masters, and rendered only very misleading accounts to the shareholders. Some of them, being directors of several companies at a time, were able to carry on the affairs of several apparently independent concerns, operating to the detriment of one and the profit of another.

Joint directing bodies managing several businesses had come into being through various processes. The *cartel*, of German origin, devised for avoiding competition between establishments engaged in the same industry, took the form of a contract by which each participating unit bound itself to produce only a fixed quantity and sell only at a uniform price. The *trust*, of Anglo-American origin, was an agreement between different companies to bring all their businesses into line, as determined by the general directing body, with a view to controlling the market and fixing prices. The *holding company*, of English origin, combined businesses of different kinds under the direction of the same bank. These modes of concentration made industrial and commercial enterprises increasingly dependent upon credit establishments.

Effect of these changes

Science being the same for all men, the methods invented in the more advanced countries were used by all the rest. From end to end of Europe the same machines were in use — railways and ships, telegraphs and telephones, methods of cultivation and manufacture, stores and banks. Under the influence of an international civilization, economic life became uniform. The result was a far greater uniformity in material life. But the degree of economic activity has come to differ increasingly in various countries, for the pace of it has increased more rapidly in proportion to the degree of progress already prevailing in the country. Europe has come more and more to be divided into two parts: on the one hand a region of large-scale industry (Great Britain, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and north-eastern France), joined at the end of the century by the Scandinavian states and Germany, and by northern Italy since the development of its electrical power; and, on the other hand, the rest of Europe, consisting of agricultural regions scattered with islands of highly organized industry.

Only the more advanced part of Europe is included in what is known as the “capitalist” system — a term which is, moreover, an exaggeration; for too large a proportion of economic activity still remains outside it. It may at least be said that it employs a “capitalist” method. The sum used in a business whose sole purpose is to make a profit is provided by anonymous owners having no personal connection with the business, and constitutes an impersonal *capital*. Its capacity for earning profits by its transactions, in spite of competition, is not caused solely by the use of machines and technical methods, but is also due to the rational organization of business, obviating waste of time and extravagance and making it possible to lower costs by reducing the number of those employed. The model for this was provided by the “Taylor system,” which regulates every movement of the operative, by “chain” labour, which allots a single operation to each workman, and by the American method of “standardization,” which reduces each type of article to a very small number of identical models. The concentration of business enterprises under the control of a bank has begun to eliminate the competition which had been regarded as the “soul of commerce” ever since the seventeenth century.

Social changes

Social changes now depended less upon natural conditions and more upon the new conditions of production, which made it possible to provide a livelihood for a greater number of inhabitants without lowering their standard of living. It was therefore able to increase rapidly, and in 1910 reached almost 450,000,000. The increase was very uneven, being very great both in the backward countries of eastern and southern Europe and in the areas of large-scale industry, and very small in France, though its industrial population increased. England reached a density of 618 inhabitants to a square mile, Germany of 310, and Italy of 313, while France remained at 191. The proportion of the population in town and country changed rapidly. In Europe, taken as a whole, the urban population rose between 1860 and 1900 by from 25 to 36 per cent, in eastern Europe from 34 to 48 per cent. The number of towns with a population of 100,000 rose from 42, with a joint population of 12,500,000, to 183, with a population of 66,000,000 in 1913. The increase in the means of existence served to maintain a far denser population in the great industrial regions, but in France it made the population less congested and life much easier, especially in the country districts, where it decreased. Emigration fell greatly in Great Britain, and, during the twentieth century, in Germany, where before 1890 it had reached a maximum of 350,000 in one year. The largest number of emigrants now came more and more from the very poor agricultural peoples, the southern Italians, Slovaks, Poles, and Russian Jews. Between 1860 and 1890 the proportion of the urban population to the whole rose from 25 to 36 per cent.

The transformation of society was the result of a simultaneous change in the conditions of political and material life, affecting different countries and elements in society very unequally. The enormous increase in production once more created an abundance of commodities for consumption and enjoyment, which was calculated to make life more convenient and varied. The unprecedented abundance of money and fiduciary paper created an enormous quantity of personal wealth no longer consisting in material things such as land or personal effects. It did not now take the form even of a debt due from one person to another; it had become a *title* or claim, an impersonal

right easily bought or sold, an abstract right to be paid a sum without knowing the debtor. Money itself had ceased to be anything but a claim upon a State bank.

The increase of this wealth, being more rapid than that of the population, created a surplus of the means of production and consumption, which was much the greatest in the industrial regions of western Europe. The division of society into classes of unequal rank, common to all the European peoples, had become fixed at a time when wealth consisted in the personal possession of land. But when wealth consisting in the possession of securities had spread to an enormous number of people of all social positions, and the Government no longer recognized differences of rank, the distinctive signs of the former classes became obliterated or confused. In the backward states of eastern Europe—in Hungary, Rumania, Poland, East Prussia, and Bohemia—the nobility still remained a closed world, consisting of the families of great landowners received at court, among whom were recruited the high officials and most of the officers. Except in Prussia, where the landowners worked at farming their estates, the nobles continued to lead an idle life, and admitted to their society hardly any persons of different social position.

In western and central Europe, where life was more vigorous and most of the old families extinct, the nobles had ceased to form a compact mass even where they still existed and intermarried. The English *gentry* consisted chiefly of enriched families who had bought a large estate, and even the nobility was coming more and more to consist of lords of recent creation. The nobles were still not in the habit of practising any gainful profession, and were therefore far less rich than the bourgeois owning large fortunes in securities, except when they consented to a misalliance with a rich Jewish or American heiress. As the system of government became a parliamentary one, the ministers, even in England, were no longer recruited among the nobility.

It was the former upper class in the towns, the bourgeoisie, who had gained most in number, wealth, political power, and social consideration, for their superior rank was acquired through wealth in securities, public office, and the professions requiring a special education. Their rise was consequently greater in countries where economic and intellectual life had become far more active, and the

wealth, education, and importance of the official classes had increased — that is, in western and northern Europe. But in Russia, where the nobility was an artificial creation of the Tsar's and the bourgeoisie no more than an official name, the idea arose of a class formed by education and known as the *intelligentsia*. The bourgeoisie came more and more to include persons with very different standards of living, but with no marked line of division between them, for the standard of living depended upon a number of conditions combined in different proportions — wealth, education, birth, rank in the hierarchy, and the nature of the profession. On the highest level came the upper middle class, having at its head the financial magnates (known in French as “*la haute banque*”), whose wealth, founded upon credit and speculation, was unlimited; and after these the wholesale merchants, great industrialists, and high officials. Below these came the “medium” (*moyenne*) bourgeoisie, formed mainly of the liberal professions (law and medicine), officials, clergy, moderately wealthy industrialists and merchants, literary men and artists.

On a lower level, a profound change had taken place since the end of the nineteenth century, especially in France — the formation of a “petty” bourgeoisie (or lower middle class) consisting of small employers, commercial clerks and assistants, and minor officials. Its standard of living had risen, because these people had profited by the abundance of production to provide themselves with semi-luxury goods, and its social position had come to approximate to that of the “medium” bourgeoisie, as was shown plainly by the costume of its women, which was no longer distinguishable from that of ladies.

Below these there remained the manual labourers. The growth of large-scale industry had greatly increased the proportion of workers concentrated in large establishments and decreased that of home-workers, among whom there is still a large majority of women engaged in making fine underclothing, lace, and embroidery. Large-scale industry has almost caused the disappearance of certain independent craftsmen, such as shoemakers, hatters, and clockmakers. But the proportion of independent artisans, among whom must be counted those in the building trades, was not notably diminished, even in the industrial regions.

With the exception of gardeners, vine-growers, and market-gardeners, whose mode of life assimilates them to artisans, the propor-

tion between the different kinds of agricultural labour did not change much in the backward lands of eastern Europe, where great estates were still the rule. In the more advanced west European countries the number of day-labourers greatly decreased after the agricultural crisis which began in 1880 as a result of the competition of produce from non-European countries, especially in England, where the area under cultivation was greatly reduced. The new agricultural machinery deprived the day-labourers of their means of livelihood, and they went to the towns, where they found higher and more regular wages, less coarse food, and more distractions and became servants or workmen. Even in Russia, where the land left to the peasants was no longer sufficient for them, they provided labour for the large-scale industries artificially created by high import duties.

Changes in the standard of living

The rapid progress in economic activity transformed the people's mode of life, especially in the more advanced countries, where consumption increased owing to the abundance of agricultural produce imported from distant lands, as well as of industrial products. Food became more abundant, thanks to the influx of meat, dairy produce, sugar, wine and spirits, and particularly wheat and flour, which caused the disappearance of famine, and even of food-shortage, except in Russia. Clothing became more varied, thanks to the low prices of materials, underlinen, ready-made clothing, machine-made boots and hats. Imitation jewelry and artificial silk brought personal adornment within the reach of the masses. Housing was improved by concrete buildings, glazed bricks, window-glass, printed wallpapers, kitchen equipment, taps with running water and water-closets, bathrooms, hot-water radiators and central heating, gas heating and lighting, and later by electric light.

Medical practice was revolutionized by micro-biology, which isolated the bacilli of rabies, plague, cholera, typhoid, diphtheria, and tuberculosis and created antiseptic and aseptic surgery, which enabled operations to be safely performed. The discovery of anæsthetics enabled surgeons to treat wounds and even operate in many diseases. The X-ray has aided diagnosis, and vaccines and serums have made preventive treatments possible, while the discovery of the ways in which plague and cholera are spread has resulted in the

prompt checking of all epidemics. All these forms of progress have decreased mortality, especially among children, and raised the average duration of life to a level hitherto unknown in Europe.

Amusements found new forms, thanks to new or improved inventions, in the phonograph and cinematograph (which, first used to reproduce real events, became the popular form of theatrical entertainment), in sports introduced from England, and in the revival of dancing in livelier forms. Books, reviews, and newspapers with a much improved standard of illustration obtained such a wide circulation that they found their way even among the masses; and more numerous and brighter theatres, museums, and exhibitions provided a permanent source of entertainment for a growing public.

Thus life has gained in length, healthiness, variety, activity, amenity, and comfort, though to a very varying degree in different countries and elements of the population, but especially in the richer and more active countries, which made quick profits by selling the products of their industry and their credit to those which were less rich. The bourgeoisie, having more money at its disposal, benefited most by this progress, and so did even the lower middle classes, for the new forms of production affected semi-luxury goods, cheap imitations of the luxuries hitherto reserved to a small minority, which enabled the women, in particular, to acquire the outward appearance of the bourgeoisie and feel that they had raised their standard of living. Manual labourers gradually adopted a bourgeois standard of living, which began with the consumption of meat, wine, or beer — the symbols of a well-to-do existence — extended to tobacco, coffee, and liqueurs and then to clothing, and was completed by bourgeois amusements. They took to reading newspapers and popular novels and managed, like the bourgeoisie, to acquire general information (or rather formulas). Thus they became fit to enter political life on obtaining the franchise. This transformation, which was marked in the towns and especially the great cities, hardly affected country people as yet. The country population took advantage of the profits from the rise in commodity prices to buy land or save money, but made little change in their mode of existence.

Beneath the uniform appearance now acquired by all European peoples as the result of using the same methods of work and obtaining the same products from it, the standard of living has risen to such an

unequal extent that the contrast between the wretched existence of the peasants in the more backward regions of Europe and the extreme wealth of the upper middle classes in the more advanced countries has become greater today than at any other time.

Changed relations

The change in the conditions of material and political life affected the relations between classes and persons far more strongly in those countries which were more advanced by reason of their economic activity and political system.

The privileged minority still felt a sense of superiority to the mass of the people. It continued to obtain its farmers and day-labourers, maidservants and household staff from families in the country. But the similarity in the conditions of life softened any impression of distance between the more well-to-do and the lower middle classes. The sense of misalliance between the nobles and very wealthy bourgeois had grown fainter and was diminishing in the middle classes. The son of a bourgeois might marry a girl of the lower middle classes or, with more difficulty, a working girl, without a breach with his family. People of high rank in society attached less importance to showing their rank by haughty manners and a distant tone. The lower classes adopted a less humble attitude and mode of address towards the bourgeois and nobles. The feelings and manners of former days survived in the eastern countries of Europe, which remained under the domination of the aristocracy.

In private relations the forms of authority grew milder, just as they had done between Government and subjects. The hitherto universal practice by which the head of the family showed his authority over his wife and children, and even his servants, by the primitive process of beating them persisted in the more backward countries and among the lower classes of the people elsewhere. But the use of corporal punishment in the family and schools began to appear exceptional and came to be forbidden by law in the more advanced countries. The public authorities would interfere to prevent parents from treating their children with violence.

The dependence of women was mitigated by law, and still more by custom. Women were gradually admitted to the various salaried

professions, which provided them with an independent means of livelihood — teaching in public schools, the post-office, medicine, law, minor posts in the public service, and such private employment as book-keeping, secretarial work, and typewriting. Hence they were no longer obliged to marry for a livelihood. Adultery on the part of a wife, formerly a capital offence, continued to be regarded as a misdemeanour in the eyes of the law, but the penalties were no longer applied. Judicial separation and divorce became easier, except in the Catholic countries of the south, where the clergy succeeded in upholding the indissoluble character of marriage.

In the more advanced countries women would no longer allow motherhood to be forced upon them, as is proved by the fall in the birth-rate. As the result of practical conditions, the subjection of girls was less strict among the lower classes, or at least among manual labourers, than in noble and bourgeois families, where they were not allowed to go out or associate with young men without a chaperon, and their future husband was chosen by their parents. Relations between young people of opposite sexes became freer. Girls were able to go out alone in the towns and began to be allowed to become students and choose their own husbands. Manners changed less in the southern countries, where married women, too, were less free. In Russia, where the subjection of the women of the people was still complete, young girls of the *intelligentsia* began to enjoy freedom as students.

A similar change took place in the relations between employers and workmen, the former treating the latter with more consideration and using their power less despotically. Great Britain, having remedied the most serious abuses by forbidding employers to exploit defenceless creatures such as children, women, and young persons, set the example, followed by other states, of regulating hours of work for women and children by law, organizing insurance against sickness, old age, and accident, and appointing a staff of inspectors to secure the observance of the law. The unions founded by English workmen had set the example of association in unions and federations, which forced employers to maintain or raise the standard of living and demanded reforms. This was followed at a later date and only partially in France, where “syndicates” and labour exchanges were formed on the English model and attempted to unite in a “Gen-

eral Confederation of Labour" (C.G.T.), but without much success up to the war. In Germany the labour associations worked in harmony with the Socialist party.

The Jews benefited by the movement in favour of equality for all. Their liberation started in France at the Revolution, and gradually extended to other states. In those countries — Italy, Spain, France, and Great Britain — in which, being few in number, they had become assimilated, they were freed from legal restrictions and admitted to the State schools and to public office without much resistance. They had more difficulty in obtaining legal equality and were still held aloof in the countries of eastern Europe, where they formed compact masses, preserving their own customs, costume, and language, which is German with an admixture of Hebrew words. Personal relations became more humane, crowds less brutal, violent brawls less frequent, and the authorities less tyrannical. This unprecedented softening of manners led to an increase of liberty and equality in Europe for the great mass of people, hitherto subject to a small privileged minority. It greatly diminished the sum of material suffering produced by privation and ill-treatment and the moral suffering caused by oppression, humiliation, and a sense of injustice.

Intellectual life

Intellectual life was also transformed by the rapid progress of the sciences, the modification of old beliefs and the influence of new methods of propagating ideas; but far less so by the influence of literature and the arts.

Scientific research began to engage the attention of the public and of governments, chiefly on account of its practical applications. They spent larger and larger sums on increasing the number of universities, technical schools, observatories, and laboratories and maintained an increasing number of professors and assistants for teaching and research. Intercourse between learned men of all nations became more frequent through scientific publications, congresses, and joint enterprises. Science became more and more international, and America entered into collaboration with Europe. Research into the physical sciences ended by revolutionizing the hitherto received conception of the universe and the laws of nature in two directions. In the direction of the infinitely great, the observations of astronomy, which now

disposed of far more powerful telescopes, and the mathematical calculations of the rate at which light travels and the deviation of light-rays led to the theory of relativity and the conception of a limited universe. In the direction of the infinitely small, the study of atoms and the discovery of radioactivity led to the conception of the atom as formed of a prodigious number of electrons in an enormously rapid state of motion, so that, in opposition to the view commonly held, matter appeared as a vacuum, through which move at a prodigious speed particles separated by distances proportionately equal to that between the sun and the planets. The universe, whether on a great or a small scale, now appeared inaccessible to the human intelligence.

Biology was revolutionized first by the study of microbes and then by the discovery of toxins and serums; and the theory of evolution was upset by the discovery of abrupt mutations.

This revolution in our conceptions did not affect either the idea of unity in the nature of the universe, or that of the unity of science; but it altered the idea which was held of the laws laid down by science.

The laws of physics no longer seemed accurate on the scale of the infinitesimally small, where movements seemed to take place by chance; and regularity now appeared only in the sum of the results, in the form of "statistical laws."

Philosophers, abandoning metaphysics, attempted to found two new sciences of observation: "experimental psychology," which studied beings of different characters or age, and "sociology," or the study of social phenomena, especially among uncivilized peoples.

New branches of knowledge grew out of the "scientific" and historical study of changes in languages, religions, law, and economic and political systems. The knowledge acquired by science spread directly only among the small group of specialists in learning and education, and reached the public through the agency of schools, encyclopædias, and newspapers merely in the form of distorted fragments or popular catchwords. Christian beliefs had lost their practical foundation—the fear of hell. Religious practices were now felt to be necessary to salvation only by such believers as had remained docile followers of the clergy.

In the Orthodox lands of eastern Europe, where the clergy had little moral influence, the people remained attached to ritual practices, but became indifferent in matters of belief. In the Lutheran

countries the dogmatic instruction compulsory in all schools no longer sufficed to foster belief. In England the officially established Church still held beliefs analogous to natural religion, which had now become mainly a form of moral teaching. The belief in Satan revived among Dissenters attending chapels, and showed itself in its most recent form in the "Salvation Army."

In the Catholic countries the clergy maintained the teaching of dogmas fixed in an immutable form. The attempt made since the beginning of the nineteenth century in France, Germany, and Italy to reconcile Catholic doctrine with modern habits of thought and the results of the historical study of Christianity was condemned by Pius X under the name of *modernism*. Believers were little concerned to acquire a real knowledge of the doctrines taught in a summarized form by the catechism. The clergy no longer endeavoured to retain believers solely by religious means, but by methods copied from the laity: religious newspapers, meetings for recreation, and associations of young people.

The void left in men's minds by the collapse of religious belief was filled by so-called "philosophic" beliefs. These consisted chiefly in faith in the *progress* achieved by science, which had become the "positivist" creed. In England it was combined with "agnosticism," which renounced such knowledge of things as is unattainable to science. Inspired by compassion for human misery, it became a cult of humanitarianism, which, like "natural religion," took as the object of life the happiness of all mankind.

Socialist doctrine permeated the mass of the people and developed into an active faith under the form of "Marxism." It proclaimed a better future, in which the ideal of happiness for all mankind would be realized at an indeterminate date, which, however, this doctrine allowed men to hope might not be far off. Like the Christian faith, it had its dogmas, creeds, and councils.

Another kind of popular belief, arising out of a sense of community between members of the same nation, took the form of a *nationalism* hostile to all foreigners. It had started in a vague form through the evocation of an idealized national past, at the time of the resistance to Napoleon. In Germany it was consolidated into a pseudo-scientific doctrine based upon a confusion between race and language (see Chapter I). Each nation was assimilated to a *race*,

designated by the name of a language (Celtic, German, or Slav). A French Romantic added that the "Germanic race" remained the only pure branch of the "Aryan race," superior to all others. This sentiment revived the hatred felt in Germany for the Jewish people, as belonging to a race alien to Europe. Thus arose anti-Semitism, now directed not against the religion of the Jews, but against their race. In the countries of eastern Europe, in which there were numbers of Jews, it brought in an era of petty persecutions and violence and, in the Russian Empire, even of local massacres. The response of the Jews was to create a defensive nationalism known as *Zionism*.

Information and beliefs were disseminated by education. Primary education, which had long been imposed by the religious authorities in Lutheran countries, gradually became compulsory in principle and afterwards free, especially in the states of western and central Europe, but more slowly in England. In eastern and southern Europe the process remained incomplete. Secondary education in schools for the children of the well-to-do was still based upon the study of Latin and literature, but gradually embraced the physical and natural sciences, history, and modern languages. It was supplemented by the foundation of girls' schools, in which far more scope was allowed to modern studies. In Catholic countries these entered into competition with the convents, which had had the monopoly of education for women.

Among adults, information and ideas were propagated chiefly by the newspapers. Commercial advertising made it possible to sell below cost price, for a trifling sum, a paper containing as much as a whole volume on the most varied subjects, so as to attract all classes of the public, including even the uncultured women of the lower classes.

Writers produced increasing quantities of works which commercial enterprise brought into wider contact with the public. Literature used the traditional form of verse less and less. Poetry, confined to the lyrical variety, found expression chiefly in short pieces with a subtle technique, which left the public almost indifferent. What found favour with it were prose works, the novel of contemporary manners, and the comedy or drama of daily life. The plastic arts produced works of increasing variety and endeavoured to devise new forms of technique. Musical composers sought to produce new effects

by more difficult technique and varied instrumentation. Artists in every department paid most attention to the opinion of specialists and cared less about pleasing the public by attractive work, preferring to command attention by startling novelties, often intended to shock its taste.

During this long period of peace every sort of activity — political, technical, economic, and scientific — had worked together to bring about unprecedented progress throughout Europe in liberty, equality, peace, humane ideas, plenty, and the convenience and amenity of life.

THE GREAT WAR AND ITS SEQUEL



The World War

The period of peace between states, during which Europe was evolving towards democratic representative government and rapid economic progress, was interrupted by a universal war of unprecedented scope, which revolutionized the whole life of the peoples.

The incident out of which it arose took place on the former territory of the Ottoman Empire, the only region where wars had still been going on. The Austrian Government took the initiative by attacking Serbia. It had reckoned upon "localizing the war," but the conflict became a European one. It is now established that no government deliberately desired to provoke a general war. But the general staffs pressed their Governments to secure the advantage of the offensive, which was then regarded as giving a decisive superiority. To avoid a war on two fronts, the German General Staff had resolved to destroy the French army by a very rapid campaign before turning upon Russia, a course that involved the invasion of Belgium, in spite of the fact that its neutrality had been guaranteed by all the great powers. This invasion determined the English Government to enter the war, Italy proclaiming its neutrality.

The two opposing coalitions gained reinforcements during the war, but of very unequal strength. The Central Empires had no allies except the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria. The Triple Entente attracted to it all the remaining European states except Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the three Scandinavian kingdoms, as well as nearly all the states of America and the Far East.

The war revolutionized the internal politics of states and revealed the force of national sentiment. The Socialists, who at their international Congress had debated the means of preventing war, voted the war credits and fought on both sides. Many Czech and Yugoslav soldiers from the Austrian Empire went over to the Russian or Serbian armies, and Polish legions fought against Russia.

The Government in every state assumed the form of a regime of public safety, under which all political liberties were suspended. It imposed military service upon all able-bodied men, even in Great Britain, and ultimately placed the inhabitants of the country on rations.

The course of the war belied all forecasts. Military theory had anticipated a short war decided by an attack which the enormous progress in offensive arms should have rendered irresistible. Economists believed the states incapable of supporting for long the enormous expenditure necessitated by great armies and the stoppage of economic life. The war lasted for four years and three months and cost sums which nobody would have believed it possible to raise. The offensive was met by a defence which prevented all the traditional operations of a "war of movement." It was the "war of attrition" that proved decisive. The Central Empires, victorious at the outset, could only keep up communications with the outer world through two narrow outlets, the Adriatic and the North Sea. Their opponents, having the command of the seas, succeeded in establishing a blockade which prevented them from renewing their armaments and feeding their population. The Allies disposed of far greater resources, and their communications by sea with the whole world remained open. Yet they, too, required the aid of a people foreign to Europe. The victory took an unprecedented form. The German Empire, whose armies were still in occupation of enemy territory, was forced by the exhaustion of its people to sue unconditionally for peace.

Even before the end of the war, political life in the three empires had suffered an upheaval through the revolt of their subjects: in the Russian Empire through violent action by the party of social revolution; in the Austro-Hungarian Empire through the nationalist revolutions of the Czechs and Slovaks, the southern Slavs, and the Rumanians of Transylvania; in the German Empire through a mutiny of sailors and soldiers behind the front and a Socialist rising.

Political effects of the war

The war completely transformed the map of central Europe by applying the formula of "self-determination," proposed by the President of the United States. This principle was applied without difficulty to the four peoples of foreign extraction separated from the Russian Empire — the Finns, Estonians, Letts, and Lithuanians — and to the lands conquered by Prussia. But the reconstituted Poland received not only territories in Silesia and Pomerania which had been separated from it for many centuries, but also a portion of White Russia and a region inhabited by Ruthenes, who were promised an autonomy which the Polish Government failed to give them.

This principle could not possibly be applied in the Austrian Empire, where the same region might be inhabited by a mixture of different nationalities, or in Bohemia, forming as it did a strong geographical and economic unit which it seemed impossible to dismember. Compact territories were constituted in which, though one nation had the majority, there remained minorities of a different nationality. The treaties laid the governments under the obligation of recognizing the freedom of these "national minorities" to preserve their nationality — that is, their language, religion, schools, and private law. This rule could, however, be interpreted in different ways, and some governments, intoxicated with national pride, have done so in bad faith. Nations formerly oppressed have in their turn used the procedure of persecution against the language and schools of the minorities, and no protection was established for the minorities in the victorious states.

Only five of the six great powers remained, Austria and Hungary having been reduced to the dimensions of small states. Four states of medium power were created (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Jugoslavia), which, with Spain, bring the number up to five, though one of them, Poland, claims to be treated as a great power. This figure had never been equalled since the sixteenth century.

Changes in systems of government

The catastrophe also caused an upheaval in the internal politics of the peoples. The number of states in Europe (excluding the Ottoman Empire) rose from twenty to twenty-seven, and the proportion

between the two forms of government was reversed. Instead of seventeen monarchies and three republics, there were now thirteen monarchies — one of which, Hungary, was without a king — and fourteen republics, three of which were great powers. The greater part of the territory and population of Europe had exchanged the monarchical for the republican form of government. With the exception of Russia, the republics had adopted the French model, a centralized government with an elected head of the State (president), a democratic assembly, and responsible ministers. All the states, monarchical as well as republican, adopted universal suffrage, the new ones adding the recent innovations of proportional representation and female suffrage, which was suddenly introduced by the United States and Great Britain at the end of the war, and used, under their influence, in the national plebiscites. It has been introduced into all the new states, but was not adopted by the other states in the west and south of Europe, except in Spain, where it was part of the Socialist program after the Revolution of 1931.

The war had consequences which have dominated the political life of every state. The chief of these has been due to the unexampled expenditure by the governments on the war. This could only be met by enormous loans, the interest upon which swallowed up so large a proportion of the revenues of the states that they were no longer able to pay their expenses. Most states, burdened with a chronic deficit, could only raise funds by issuing increasing quantities of paper money, which depreciated more and more. Some of them carried inflation to such lengths that their money lost all its value; others maintained their currency, but depreciated to a fraction of its value — in France to a fifth. The principal task of the governments has been to deal with these crises in currency, exchanges, the treasury, and taxes.

War in its new form left a profound impression upon the peoples. Nothing was left of that which had always given it the attractiveness of a moving spectacle — manœuvres in the field, assaults, brilliant heroism, the intoxication of victory. It now recalled nothing to combatants but the perils, disgust, and monotony of existence in the mud of the trenches, horrible wounds, deadly gases, and long-drawn-out terror. To the mass of the people it stood for anguish, privation, and ruin. The general feeling in the whole of Europe was a horror of war and a passionate desire never to experience it again. While estab-

lishing a permanent peace among all the states, the governments retained the conviction that the best means of averting war was to keep a powerful army always ready for action; but in order to satisfy the desire of their people for peace, they were compelled to carry on incessant negotiations with other governments, which were anxiously followed by the public.

Thus money and foreign politics, two things which before the war had had hardly any place in party conflicts, became the prevailing cause of anxiety to both peoples and governments. But the war, having become a struggle to the death between the peoples, had left behind it hatreds which were fomented by national sentiment. Small but violent nationalist groups carried on a fierce campaign of demonstrations against the desire for peace and reconciliation. Obligated for four years to live in uniform and under arms, the "nationalists" had acquired a taste for wearing uniform, possessing arms, and combining under the command of a leader, and these new sentiments transformed the political life of the peoples, above all in Germany.

Political systems

If we consider only the official forms of the governments, evolution towards a parliamentary and democratic system appeared to be proceeding at an accelerated pace, and had extended to all the new states under the radical form of a republic with universal suffrage. But there were still wide differences between the practice of various states.

In those of the west and north, accustomed to political liberty (Great Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian kingdoms), the system went on unchanged, and, while retaining the monarchical form (except in France and Switzerland), was operated in a republican spirit. It was more or less effective in two new states: in Finland after a civil war with the Socialists, and in Czechoslovakia under the guidance of two disinterested professors. But it had become impossible to make it work on the two-party system, with each in power alternately. Even in Great Britain, its country of origin, the "triangular" struggle between Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour prevented government by a majority consisting of a single party. In France division into *groups*, none of which could have a majority, was increased by the split-up of the Socialist party into four fragments

and that of the parties of the Right into small fractions, which raised the number of groups to some fifteen. "Proportional representation," as established in the new states, broke the contact between electors and elected and made the deputies into delegates of the committee in control of their party. It hastened the process of disintegration into small parties based upon different programs — that is, formulas — and sentiments. A majority could only be formed by uniting a number of groups inspired by contradictory sentiments.

The Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic party, reviving the name *Communist* (used by Marx in 1848), had founded a Third International, controlled by a committee sitting in Moscow. It used the resources of the Empire for the creation of a Communist party in every state to prepare for a general war as a prelude to social revolution. The Socialist parties which still adhered to the Second International abandoned the revolutionary tactics of class warfare, worked in concert with the "bourgeois" parties, and even had seats in the ministries. Disagreement on the question of tactics led to fresh splits. In several states there had grown up an "agrarian" peasant party, a nationalist party, and parties representing national minorities. At the elections of 1928 in Poland there were as many as thirty-one lists of candidates.

The majority required by the parliamentary system could no longer be obtained except through a coalition. When no combination proved feasible, there remained the expedient of a "technical ministry" formed of men chosen from outside the parties, and especially officials. A device resorted to during the war was also employed: to find a way out of a grave financial crisis, British politicians formed a sort of ministry of public safety, supported by a coalition between the party in power and the dissentient members of the other two parties, which had remained in opposition.

The struggle between the parties in the Chambers was moderated by a new procedure adopted in almost every state: that of referring the matter for discussion to a committee formed of delegates of all parties, which drafted the measure and obtained its passage through the Chamber.

Conflicts between electors belonging to the various parties were still violent. Universal suffrage, equal and direct, turned every election into a clash of popular passions or particular interests, which

The dictatorships

left little room for reflexion on the practical conditions requisite for all government. Those elected, being preoccupied with satisfying their electors, and often ill-acquainted with the complicated mechanism of a centralized state, sought to govern by the easy-going device of using the public funds to satisfy all demands, regardless of what have been called "the necessities of State" — that is, the necessity for any government of having a treasury full enough to pay its officials and creditors regularly. The public was prone to forget that the State funds can consist of nothing but the money of its taxpayers or creditors. Parties with Socialist tendencies, accustomed to revolutionary formulas, did not hesitate to expropriate property-owners and those holding State securities.

The dictatorships

In all the states of central and eastern Europe, where the people were not yet accustomed to political liberty, the officially established Government was shortlived. In three out of the five great states it was formally abolished and replaced by one fundamentally opposed to it.

The first example was set by Russia, where, under the name of "the dictatorship of the proletariat," the Communist party had established a government possessing absolute power. It had prohibited all other parties, suppressed all political liberty, and created a far more efficient police system than that of the Tsar, the "Extraordinary Commission for the Repression of Counter-revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage," afterwards replaced by the "police administration" (G.P.U.), charged not only with arresting and imprisoning suspects, but also with deciding their fate. It did not, like a revolutionary tribunal, use the forms of a trial, but gave judgments from which there was no appeal and which were at once carried out in secret; the object was not to put supposed opponents on trial, but to get rid of them.

This system was distinguished from all others by two innovations for which no precedent existed. Firstly, it gave itself out to be not a national state established on a territory whose name it bore, but a nameless federation of lands, "the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" (U.S.S.R.), created for the purpose of bringing about a universal Communist revolution and open to all peoples that might ask to enter it. And, secondly, the suffrage was limited, but in the opposite sense to all other systems. Instead of being confined to

The dictatorships

those possessing wealth, it was granted only to "proletarians" — that is, manual labourers.

In theory, the system was representative. Power belonged to the people, represented by an annual congress of delegates from all the lands of the Union, elected by indirect suffrage in several degrees, starting with the primary *soviet* (council), which consisted of the peasants of both sexes in a village or the workmen in an industrial establishment. (It has as its emblem the hammer and sickle.)

In practice, power was exercised by a "Council of People's Commissars," performing the functions of ministers and in close touch with the Committee of the Communist party, the secretary of which ultimately became the absolute master of all power. There was an occult connection between it and the Committee of the Third International that was in charge of propaganda in foreign countries. The election of delegates to the supreme Congress took place by a show of hands, the names being put forward by a party delegate, who allowed none but Communists or those "without party" to stand. The reform announced at the end of 1936 promised to establish a direct and secret franchise. The Government, having repelled the attacks of the Russian generals supported by the Allies, and exterminated or cowed all its opponents, even when they were Socialists, worked to bring about a social revolution according to the Communist ideal by revolutionary measures: the abolition of private property, trade, individual labour, and money.

Next a dictatorship was established in Italy by the small nationalist group known as *Fascists* (*fascisti*), with the aid of the army commanders and great industrialists, who were alarmed at the Communist agitation among the workers. Its head assumed power under the new title of *Duce* (leader), without abolishing the King, or even, at first, the Chambers. He gradually organized an absolutist dictatorship based upon the doctrine of Fascism. He proclaimed himself the enemy of liberalism and parliamentary government, and even of the policy of peace between the peoples. The nation, he said, is an "organism, whose aims and means of action are superior in power and duration to those of individuals, whether associated or in isolation." "Everything lies within the State and ought to serve the ends of the State." This is the significance of the term *totalitarian regime*. The duty of education is to take a man from childhood upwards and form

him by military drill, so as to prepare him for a war which shall restore to the Italian people the prestige of Imperial Rome. To apply this system the State established a police which kept watch over all individuals, and exceptional tribunals giving judgment according to no fixed rules. It suppressed all newspapers or placed them under its supervision, and forbade associations and meetings. The Chamber was first reduced to impotence and then replaced by a "corporative" Chamber chosen by the Council of the Fascist party.

The Italian system of dictatorship was imitated in Germany by the head of the National Socialist party. Having risen to power by the aid of the great industrialists and army commanders after a long campaign of agitation based on a program of social reforms in favour of the peasants and workmen, and by appealing to the pride of the "German race" and their hatred of the Jews, he assumed the title of *Führer* (leader), translated from the Italian. He had promised to abolish "incomes without work" and loans at interest and to expropriate the owners of large estates, but the minor leaders who tried to compel him to carry out this program were massacred by order of the Leader. He adopted the doctrine of the "totalitarian State," which turns the individual into an instrument for establishing the power of the "German race." The Jews were declared to be disqualified from becoming Germans and were excluded from society on the plea of the purity of the Aryan race. He suppressed all political liberty, reduced the elections to a mere ratification of the Government's choice, and created exceptional tribunals and a secret political police. This system exalts the virtues of war, preparing children for it by a "totalitarian" education, and young men by military drill and nationalist parades. The repressive measures were completed by "concentration camps," where those in opposition were imprisoned, tortured, and humiliated.

Dictatorship was established in the watered-down form of a government with absolute power, though only on a temporary footing and without any theoretical justification, in almost all the new states: in Estonia, Latvia (after an interval of a regular liberal government), and Poland, through the personal dictatorship of a Socialist who had become a general on the plea of the safety of the State; and in those of southern Europe: in Portugal, where a professor was placed in power by the army, in Spain, by a general at odds with the King, in Yugoslavia, as an expedient for stopping the struggle between the Serbs

and Croats, and in Bulgaria, Greece, and Rumania by the aid of the king.

External politics

An official act inserted in the peace treaties — the Covenant, which was the work of the President of the United States — had laid down the new principle that relations between states, like those between individuals, ought to be regulated by a contract. The “League of Nations” was formed by those states which bound themselves to settle their differences without having recourse to war. At the head of it was a General Assembly of delegates from all the states, an Executive Council of representatives of all the great powers and a few other states, elected by the Assembly, and a permanent board (*bureau*) charged with preparing the business to be laid before it.

The League actually founded for the first time an international political authority charged with applying the *law*, for the maintenance of peace between states through respect for contracts. Instead of forming the Concert of Europe by themselves, the great powers were in a minority on it. It was a permanent institution, intended to take the place of temporary congresses and create an international law capable of abolishing war. But it disposed of no material force for making its decisions respected, and when it ventured to apply economic penalties (“sanctions”), these proved inadequate. The governments themselves refused to allow the creation of a “super-state,” which would have abolished their sovereign power. Hence the League possessed none but moral force and could only use it to try to create an international opinion among the peoples strong enough to impose upon their governments the maintenance of peace. The practical relations between states have consisted chiefly in manœuvres, either to obtain the execution of the peace treaties or, conversely, to do away with their effects. The authoritarian governments backed them up by demonstrations of a warlike character, which caused an impression of insecurity to pervade Europe.

Unrest in economic life

During this transitional crisis, political and economic life were closely bound up with each other. Government action revolutionized

production, trade, currency, and credit, and the action of the governments was determined by the difficulties arising out of their inadequate resources.

The war had overthrown the stable system based upon a currency with a fixed value in gold, referred to a single, invariable standard. Gold had become both the medium for buying and selling, even to foreign countries, and the common measure by which it was possible to refer all values to the same unit. But the European states could only meet their expenditure by contracting an enormous debt, which could no longer be repaid in gold, and issued notes or treasury bills which could no longer be covered by a gold reserve. Since there was no longer a sufficiency of gold currency for it to maintain its position as an international medium of exchange, there remained no common measure of values. The paper money of the various states ceased to have a fixed value and depreciated as inflation increased. Its rate of exchange fluctuated widely according to the degree of confidence it inspired in the public, which varied from time to time and from country to country; and the exchanges fluctuated from day to day. The result was a monetary crisis of unprecedented violence, except in the neutral states and Great Britain. Gold disappeared from circulation or accumulated in the banks, and currency depreciated to such an extent that it no longer represented more than a small proportion of its nominal value, or even lost it all.

The financial crises resulting from an enormous debt, a budget deficit, a depreciated currency, and an empty treasury aggravated the economic crisis, for life in Europe was based on money with a constant value, which was approximately the same in different countries, and on credit — that is, the confidence that paper was exchangeable for gold. The crisis after the war was of a different character. The European peoples started producing and consuming more and more, using paper money of fluctuating value for buying and selling. The abundance of this fictitious money caused a rise in wages, prices of products and securities. The rise in prices stimulated production and induced the banks to grant unlimited credits on illusory security. Inflation stimulated consumers to spend more. This was what is known as the “boom period.” It seemed natural in the United States, which had profited by Europe’s necessities, but it also extended to Great

Britain and the states ruined by the war and inflation, even to Germany, which had got rid of its debt by bankruptcy and carried on its business with sums borrowed in dollars.

The war had, moreover, disturbed the relations between Europe and the other continents. Large-scale industry had given the European countries, and especially Great Britain, the advantage of supplying the chief articles of consumption to foreign peoples. The great industrial, shipping, and credit enterprises had provided a means of making large profits, investing capital abroad, and finding posts for engineers and managers, in exchange for which Europe had obtained from other continents foodstuffs and raw materials for its industries. It imported raw materials to a higher value than that of the articles it exported, and had an adverse "balance of trade," but the sums it received as interest on the capital it had lent, the commission charged by its banks, the freights earned by its vessels, the money spent in Europe by foreigners (and especially Americans) exceeded the sums paid for imports. Its "balance of credit" not only covered the deficit, but left a large surplus, and the savings thus made were used in fresh investments. The European countries were importing and creditor countries, the others exporting and debtor countries. This system of exchange called for free international trade, with no restrictions save moderate tariffs regulated by commercial treaties covering a long enough period for traders to be able to foresee exactly what import dues they would have to pay. Persons passed from one state to another as freely as goods, and passports were abolished everywhere except in the Russian Empire, where they seemed an anachronism. The war reversed these conditions. Europe, obliged to slow down production, began purchasing goods manufactured abroad, especially in the United States, and bought foodstuffs and raw materials at high prices. A few countries outside Europe were induced to found industries and work up their own raw materials, so as to replace European goods for their own home consumption and even compete with them in the world market. Instead of importing industrial products, they began to export them.

High wages had been paid for the manufacture of the engines of destruction of which the governments had had such a pressing need, and after the war these were continued during the work of making

good what had been destroyed. The prices of raw materials and the products of industry remained very high for some years.

The large profits realized, thanks to these high prices, led to the foundation of new establishments and brought fresh lands under cultivation. It seemed reasonable to increase production, for consumption stimulated demand and seemed unlimited. Workmen's wages enabled them to increase their consumption of food and luxury articles, and their expenditure was facilitated by the device (used in the United States) of the hire-purchase system. This system had produced a surplus of equipment, production, expenditure, consumption, and credit exceeding the real resources of Europe. At the same time the competition of new industries in the United States, Japan, and India narrowed down the markets open to European industries. The United States even came to supply Europe with the products of the new industries: automobiles, motion-picture projectors and films, wireless apparatus, phonographs, typewriters, office equipment, and machine-tools. This reversal in their relations upset the balance of trade, and even of credit, except for Great Britain. In order to pay for their war expenditure and reparations, the European countries sold a large portion of their holdings in loans to countries outside Europe and borrowed from the United States. From being creditors they became debtors.

The economic crisis and the depression

The period of intense activity following the end of the war was closed by a general economic depression. This began in 1929 in the United States with a general failure of the banks, which suspended payment. The result was a heavy fall in all securities, which, as the result of speculation, had risen to prices far too high for their yield. By 1930 it had spread to Europe, upsetting the whole of economic life. Since the end of the war all transactions had taken place on the assumption that everything produced would find a market at a good price. When credit broke down, the ruined or impoverished consumers abruptly lowered their demand. The result was a rapid and very marked fall in the prices of all raw materials and manufactured goods. The agricultural countries of eastern Europe, unable to sell their produce, found themselves short of cash. Industrialists slack-

ened or stopped work, lowered wages, and dismissed some of their workmen. Transport, commercial and banking concerns did less business and produced less profits. Companies made considerable reductions in their dividends and even ceased to pay any. Shares fell to an unprecedented extent. Those in possession of money, having lost confidence in investments and securities, were no longer willing to run the risk of lending it.

State intervention

Producers affected by the fall in prices called upon their governments to strengthen the "protection" granted them against foreign competition by very high customs duties. The workers, threatened with unemployment, asked for a reduction in their hours of work, so as to compel their masters to employ more labour: and the unemployed demanded allowances from the State or municipalities. But whereas producers wanted to check the fall in prices and wages, consumers complained of the "high cost of living" resulting from high prices. The governments, already overwhelmed by the cost of the public services, their armies, and the national debt, had no means of checking the crisis. They tried two contrasting methods: *deflation*, carried out by decreasing State expenditure and increasing taxation, and aiming at balancing the budget and achieving the monetary stability necessary for maintaining credit; *inflation*, effected by increasing the quantity of paper money, or compulsory *devaluation*, which, by decreasing the proportion of gold in the currency, decreased the burdens on the State and on debtors to the disadvantage of creditors. In the end devaluation carried the day even in the United States and Great Britain, though to a far smaller extent than in other states, and was accompanied in the latter by a return to a balanced budget. The devaluation of the dollar and the pound led to the abandonment of the gold standard, which had been the international criterion of values. Europe became subject to a monetary system with fluctuating values, which makes it difficult to calculate accurately the results of any transaction.

The policy of protection led governments back to the ideas of the old mercantilist school. Their aim was to keep the "balance of trade" stable, remove foreign competition, and reserve the home market for native producers. In their dread of having to depend upon

imports from abroad in time of war, they tried to organize production in such a way as to make their country self-sufficing. This is what is known as *autarchy*. Passports, instituted as a police measure during the war, were retained as a means of preventing the entry of persons likely to compete with native workers. Instead of fixing customs duties by treaty for a period of long duration, every state reserved to itself the power of changing its customs tariff at any moment in order to check fresh competition, and got rid of the "most favoured nation" clause, which maintained equal treatment among nations. To decrease foreign imports, it fixed the *quota* of goods that might be imported annually from each foreign state. To maintain the balance of trade, the value of imports from each foreign country was not to exceed the value of the exports made by the State from that country. When by devaluing its currency a government reduces the burden of wages for producers in its own country and consequently decreases their overhead charges, other states offset this advantage by additional duties with an adjustable scale dependent upon the exchange of the exporting country or a mutual adjustment of duties with the State that has devalued its currency.

The result of these measures was to hinder international trade and prevent freedom of exchange between nations, even in states still retaining a liberal political system. Internally the State dealt a serious blow at the rights of property and succession by increasing income-tax and inheritance duties to unprecedented heights. With the exception of the small northern states and Great Britain, all governments ceased to meet their expenditure by the regular procedure of taxation or redeemable loans. To meet the deficit they appropriated private savings, either by devaluing the currency, enforcing the circulation of notes — thus decreasing the value of State securities — or, in some cases, by seizing the funds of the State bank or of savings banks and and insurance companies.

The states governed by a dictatorship imposed upon all their subjects an economic system abolishing individual rights. In Russia the Communist Government began by repudiating the whole of the State debt and all foreign concessions and confiscating the funds deposited in all banks. Next it abolished all rights of property and inheritance, forbade all trading or work for wages, and turned all industrial enterprises into State establishments. Officials and work-

State intervention

ers were to be paid in kind by rations. This system, known as "war Communism," having diminished agricultural production to such a point as to cause a famine, was replaced by the "new political economy" (N.E.P.), which permitted cultivators to own a piece of land and tolerated retail trade inside the country, while reserving to the State the monopoly of foreign trade. Later it returned to some extent to a form of Communism, by trying to transform agriculture into a collective enterprise. It exterminated the well-to-do peasants, known as *kulaks*, and forced the rest to form compulsory co-operative farms (*kolchoz*) for cultivating the land in common. Next, having found that collective labour with equality of wages gave too poor a yield, it once again relaxed the system, allowing peasants belonging to the *kolchozes* the use of a small piece of land and some cattle. In order to stimulate production in industrial establishments, it granted the workers a wage proportionate to their labour. Thus a system of State control was established over a vast territory, by which all agricultural and industrial production is carried out in the form of collective labour under the direction of officials, according to a general plan imposed by an absolute government.

The Fascist Government in Italy, without abolishing property and capital, regulated the relations between employers and workmen by binding decisions. It prohibited free trade-unions and strikes, fixed wages at a low level, and forced employers to keep their works open, even at a loss, so as to give employment to the workers. It formed "corporations" directed by the Council of the Fascist party and placed the banks and insurance companies under Government control.

In Germany the National Socialist Government began by transforming the factory councils of delegates elected by the workmen in industrial establishments. To find occupation for unemployed workmen, it allotted orders to the heavy industries, especially for armaments. To maintain a fiduciary currency, it introduced an exchange control, which concentrates in one fund all sums due by foreigners to German exporters and transfers them to German importers for their foreign payments. It ordered all Germans to bring back into the country all capital invested abroad, and forbade the export of money from Germany under very heavy penalties, even that of death in the last resort.

With the object of defending their property against Government

Material progress

action those possessing money in various countries converted notes into gold and sent their gold and securities to states where it appeared to be safe: to Switzerland and Holland and, above all, to England and the United States. The gold withdrawn from circulation in most countries is being accumulated in a few, where it is no longer put to any use. The paralysis of international trade is accompanied by a slowing down of industry, resulting from a too unequal distribution of capital.

Material progress

The economic catastrophe, political in origin, did not check production, which continued on the same lines as before the war. The inventions that have transformed the life of Europe had already been made; but had not yet been brought to a point at which they could affect the masses. Technical progress improved them so that they were able to become part of everyday usage. The automobile, perfected by the progress in its engines and running on tarred roads, has become the regular mode of rapid transport for both persons and goods. Motor-cars and lorries have almost replaced horse-traction. They have the further advantage over the railways of house-to-house delivery and are tending to make many branch lines superfluous. Aviation has changed to such an extent as to become not only a formidable arm in war, but also a means of rapid transport of both passengers and postal matter to great distances. Since the invention of the talking film, the cinematograph has to some extent taken the place of the theatre and created a popular form of entertainment which has made its way into the depths of the country. Wireless has achieved the same results by broadcasting music, lectures, news, and commercial advertisements. Electricity has been utilized to a growing extent for railways, heating, and lighting. More powerful machines are now produced for traction, in which coal has been to some extent replaced by oil fuel, in the metal industries, for boring wells and mines, and for earthworks. Chemical processes have become cheaper and more efficacious.

Technical progress and, still more, the spread of improved implements and new methods of industrial and agricultural enterprise in every land have stimulated labour in agriculture, industry, transport, and commerce. The results have been more general in the more ad-

Social changes

vanced countries, but more profound in the more backward ones, where the conditions of labour were abruptly transformed, becoming similar to those in lands in which progress had its origin.

Social changes

The population has continued to increase, but very unequally, the rate being less rapid in the richer and more densely populated lands, where the birth-rate has fallen considerably. In Switzerland, Great Britain, and Germany it has fallen to fifteen per cent annually, even lower than in France, where it is seventeen per cent. In Italy it has fallen in the towns. The recent rise achieved in Germany by subsidizing marriages does not seem to be noteworthy. Hence the proportion of adults has greatly increased. The shift of population has continued. It is decreasing in the country districts, where progress in agricultural machinery has greatly reduced the demand for labour, and increasing rapidly in the great cities, to which it is attracted by the rapid increase of big businesses and in the number of minor officials. The shrinkage of the population engaged in agriculture is not set off by those who settle in the country, not as tillers of the soil, but as hotel- and garage-keepers or employees in repair-shops for passing motorists.

The crisis ensuing upon the war revolutionized society in the lands once forming part of the three empires which were destroyed. In the Russian Empire the Communist party carried out an unprecedented social revolution. It destroyed the nobility, all elements of the population known according to Marxist theory as "bourgeois," and even the rather more prosperous peasants. It allowed none to survive but manual workers and peasants living directly by their labour, and the technical experts and officials necessary for directing collective operations. A thoroughgoing agrarian reform in the Baltic lands ousted the German "barons" from Estonia and Latvia. In Czechoslovakia and Rumania it limited the amount of land that may belong to a land-owner.

The crisis produced the same effects in every land. During the period of inflation the depreciation of currency reduced the value of all that had been calculated in terms of money — all securities (the interest upon loans, investments, debts, and bonds), rents, official salaries, and pensions. On the other hand, it raised the price of all things involving cash payments — agricultural and industrial prod-

uce, transport, wages, and service. It reduced the resources of all those living upon fixed incomes (investors, creditors, and owners of real property, officials, and pensioners) and increased the resources of all those with goods, labour, or service to sell — industrial or commercial employers, bankers, peasants, workmen, shopkeepers, hotel-keepers, domestic servants, lawyers, and doctors. The subsequent fall in prices produced the opposite effect: it decreased the profits of all those engaged in production, selling, or labour and gave those living on fixed incomes the power of obtaining larger quantities of articles or services.

These abruptly contrasting changes destroyed all stability in the resources and standard of living of the whole population. The sudden and enormous variations in the remuneration of labour gave people the impression that profits or wages depended mainly upon chance. The example set by states of depreciating their currency and debt and so failing to honour their engagements upset the respect of individuals for their pledged word. The rapid shifting of wealth upset the principal basis of social distinctions. The catastrophe chiefly affected the former upper class in eastern and central Europe. The Russian nobility was exterminated, reduced to destitution, or lived in exile abroad. The great Austrian landowners were impoverished by the dismemberment of the Empire. The Prussian nobility, though left in possession of its lands, suffered from the bankruptcy of Germany and was obliged to run into debt, besides losing the political power which had been lent it by the support of the court. The great landowners of Rumania lost part of their estates, and the establishment of universal suffrage destroyed their political influence. Only in Poland and Hungary has the landed aristocracy remained in possession of its domains and rank.

In the western states, where the nobles lived on their rents and their income from securities, without practising any gainful employment, their resources were diminished by inflation, income-tax, and duties on inherited property. The nobility has everywhere descended to the level of the bourgeoisie, from which it is now distinguished only by its titles, its manners, and the remnants of its prestige.

The predominant minority is now made up of the masters of personal wealth, especially bankers and directors of credit establishments, insurance companies, mines, and metallurgical industries. It

is they who purchase country houses and great estates, own shootings, racing stables and art collections, and set the fashions. They are able to influence the trend of the money-market and the credit of the State, become proprietors of newspapers or dominate them by the placing of advertisements, and use them to influence public opinion or even thwart the Government.

The bourgeoisie in easy circumstances, living chiefly upon fixed incomes or professional salaries, suffered severely from the monetary crisis, and in Germany was even ruined by the State bankruptcy. It is the "new rich," enriched by speculation, industry, or commerce, and certain liberal professions that have benefited by the period of high prices. All the middle-class professions were crowded with those seeking employment, and young men studying for them live in anxiety lest they may find no means of livelihood. The small shopkeeping class has profited by the period of high prices to draw closer to the standard of living of the bourgeoisie.

Manual workers at first benefited by the demand for labour, which brought them work and higher wages, except in the industrial regions of England, where production, inordinately increased by the necessities of the war, decreased abruptly after it, and unemployment became acute. Increasing numbers of workmen and commercial employees have joined professional associations copied from the English *unions*, grouped in federations with a Socialist tendency, in order to obtain a reduction in hours of labour and the increase or maintenance of wages. The "International Labour Bureau," founded at Geneva, obtained the acceptance of the principle of the eight-hour day by all countries. The custom of the "collective contract" between the head of a business and his workmen was beginning to come in. Since large-scale industry had made an excessive demand for labour for a necessity which lasted only a short time, and had ceased to train apprentices, experienced workmen became too rare and there was a superabundance of unskilled labour. But after 1930, when the depression had begun, there was a shortage of work; unemployment, which had never ceased in England, spread to every country in Europe and wages fell. The unemployed lived upon grants from the State or municipalities, and became less and less fit to work. In England there were even young workers who had never had a chance to work.

The fate of the peasants in eastern Europe varied in the different

Changed standards of living

states. In Russia they were deprived of their land, the more prosperous of them, known as *kulaks*, were exterminated or ruined, and the rest became "proletarians" employed in collective enterprises. In the two states which have remained aristocratic, Poland and Hungary, the peasants are still dependent upon the great landowners and have a very low standard of living. In those regions where agrarian reform was carried out, they were able to acquire land taken from the great estates, but the benefit accruing from this varied, for it was not always possible to turn day-labourers into independent peasants capable of cultivating a piece of land. In western Europe the peasants profited by the rise in the price of agricultural produce. They were able to free themselves from debt and even to buy the lands which they had held on lease, and their standard of life rose to a level never reached before. The depression did not counteract the effects of the improvement, for even if their land no longer brought them the same profits, it still supported them.

Changed standards of living

The crisis produced profound effects upon some of the most old-established habits of the European peoples. The life of women was transformed by it, at least in the countries more advanced in civilization. During the war they took the place of men on the land and in industry and benefited by the high pay and demand for labour, while their work, being paid for in money, brought them greater independence. They increased their consumption of semi-luxury goods — clothing, ornaments, perfumes — which have obliterated the outward distinction between women in different classes of society. Almost all the professions hitherto reserved to men have been thrown open to them. The assimilation has even been complete in Russia, where a woman may perform any public service. In Germany, where the transformation was rapid, it was abruptly checked by the Government, which has closed all careers to women. Progress in domestic machinery for cleaning, washing up, laundry-work, heating, and cookery has greatly reduced the time required for housework and increased women's leisure. Women in all classes of society feel less dependent upon men and less subject to their power and have adopted freer ways. This liberty, which is quite a novelty in the world, is reflected in the change affecting two external sex distinctions which

had remained unaltered since the origins of civilized life: the long skirt and long hair have been replaced by short skirts and short hair.

The use of time has been revolutionized in the towns by shorter hours of work. Increased leisure is no longer spent in the traditional amusements, but in pleasures for which the example was set by the bourgeoisie: the theatre, which, in the form of the cinema, has spread throughout the country districts, and dancing, facilitated by the phonograph and transformed by the fashion for American dances. All countries have taken to *sport*, which has retained its English name, whether in the passive form of attending horseraces, boxing-matches, and organized public competitions of all sorts, or in that of active participation in football, tennis, swimming, rowing, running, and motor-racing, supplemented by "winter sport," especially skating and the Scandinavian sport of skiing. Never before have amusements occupied such an extensive place in life.

Intellectual life

Scientific work, which was slowed down during the war, has resumed its former progress. No striking change has appeared in the tendencies of literary or artistic work. Literature and the arts have continued to produce works of the same kinds and in the same spirit. The arts have not ceased to draw farther away from nature, painting and sculpture by the stylization of form, architecture by a preference for straight lines, music by seeking after unusual effects of orchestration.

Except in Russia, where the Communist Government has encouraged atheist propaganda, religion continues to enjoy the same social prestige and political influence and still retains the character of a rule of moral conduct and a restraint upon the passions among all those portions of the people which are still afraid of hell. It offers a mystical refuge to tender souls repelled by the ugliness of life. But its doctrines no longer exercise men's minds. Militant faith has been transferred to those things which directly affect the life of men in the present — politics and economic organization, which seem to be more and more closely bound up together.

Political and economic liberalism are no longer inspired, as in the eighteenth century, by natural religion; they no longer call for liberty in the name of an optimistic faith in the laws of nature, established

by a beneficent Providence to secure the happiness of mankind and peace between the peoples. They find their justification in the experience of the nineteenth century, which showed the practical advantages of allowing freedom of action to the individual and has made men regard liberty as the latest thing to be acquired by the most prosperous peoples.

In politics liberalism points out that the behaviour of the most civilized peoples in Europe has shown them to be capable of managing their affairs and living at peace with others; and it considers that if they are to be preserved from the intoxication of power, governments require to be watched and admonished by a free opposition.

Authoritarian policy (whether nationalist or Communist) cites the scandals and agitations, the party struggles and governmental weakness publicly exhibited by the free forms of government. It is inspired by an illimitable confidence in the wisdom and virtue of the rulers, by contempt for men and indifference to their happiness. Like the doctrine of Machiavelli and the "realistic policy" of Bismarck, it sets up to govern people by compulsion and settle the relations between them by war, through securing for itself the advantage of secrecy, impossible under a liberal regime.

In economic matters the "liberal" school, without abandoning all its general theories, recognizes that the risks inherent in all enterprises are accepted by the industrialist or trader only if he is left free to carry on his operations in the hope of profit, and considers officials incapable of the initiative necessary to success. This liberalism has as its declared enemies not only the partisans of the authoritarian system, who naturally grant the Government absolute power over all economic affairs, but other opponents as well, who, while asserting their intention to respect political liberty, desire economic life to be brought under State control for various reasons.

Some denounce the occult power of the banks, which control credit, thus making the freedom of industry and commerce a sham. In order to break their power, these people demand a "controlled economy," directed by the State; and since its economy is already partially under control, thanks to taxation, currency, and customs duties, they would like to complete the process by placing it entirely under State control. Others, shocked by a system of government under which a superabundance of products coexists with poverty and un-

employment, condemn an economy working with a view to profit and handing over its products only to those who can buy them. They propose to replace it by an economy aiming at satisfying the needs of all by increased production, without any view to profit. The wage-earners, especially in large-scale industry, for whom work has become merely a means of receiving wages, now their sole means of subsistence, suffer when they see how precarious these are, and, being threatened by unemployment, would like to see them permanent, free from risk, secured against their master, and as safe as official salaries. This is the ideal of the leaders of the labour organizations, expressed in the formula "reform of structure."

All these systems lead to the placing of all operations of production, commerce, and credit at the mercy of the Government, which, under an authoritarian system, means the dictator of the moment, and, under a liberal system, the parliament in power.

This irreconcilable contrast between various conceptions of the function of the State is creating a new kind of intellectual unrest in Europe.

CONCLUSION



At the moment when its history began, Europe was inhabited by a population belonging to the white race, very sparse except upon the shores of the Mediterranean and already possessing a rudimentary civilization: the cultivation of cereals, cattle-breeding, weaving, and metal-work. It spoke various languages derived from a common tongue and practised religions which, though based upon similar conceptions, were different. It was organized on a patriarchal and monogamous system which gave the head of the family practically unlimited power over his wife, children, and servants and over the family property.

Each region was inhabited by a population speaking the same language and following the same customs, but not constituting a race in the anthropological sense of the word, since it was the product of crosses between individuals belonging to several different varieties of the white race and was divided into a large number of small independent *peoples*, at war among themselves and governed on almost similar systems all over Europe by war leaders working in harmony with the richest heads of families and occasionally summoning the assembly of free men.

The practical processes necessary for civilized life were invented in the East and first adopted by the Greeks, the nearest neighbours of Asia, established on the shores of the Mediterranean and, afterwards, in the Hellenized kingdoms, subject to Greek kings, which arose out of the dismemberment of Alexander's Empire. They transformed the inventions of the East by applying a method of thought independent of tradition, and created the sciences and arts which became common to the whole of Europe.

Rome subjugated all the peoples on the shores of the Mediterranean and Atlantic and brought them together under a single rule in a unity of government, language, and civilization. Society was di-

vided into a very small minority of privileged persons, owning enormous domains and alone enjoying wealth, luxury, and culture, and a wretched mass formed mainly of slaves, enjoying no rights and abandoned to the arbitrary power of their masters.

After three centuries the Roman Empire, originally governed by a magistrate appointed for life and invested with absolute power, had become transformed, on the model of the kingdoms of the East, into a hereditary monarchy served by officials recruited from the privileged classes, which excluded its subjects from all affairs, accustomed them to servile obedience and made them indifferent to the public weal. It imposed upon them a religion of Oriental origin, founded in the Greek cities of the East, organized in the Greek language, and differing profoundly from all earlier religions in Europe. It imposed not only rites, but a doctrine, subjecting men to rules of conduct based upon a dualistic and pessimistic conception of the world, foreign to the West; and it brought those believing in it under the absolute authority of a clergy whose numbers were later swelled by all those believers, of both sexes, who were united in communities for the purpose of leading an ascetic life outside the cities.

This transformation of Europe on the political and religious model of the East concluded the period known as antiquity.

The Middle Ages began when the barbarian peoples, speaking Germanic languages, who had remained outside the rule of Rome and the civilization of antiquity, succeeded in establishing themselves within the Roman Empire and were replaced on their former territory by Slavonic-speaking peoples from the East of Europe, who also invaded the south-eastern region. By ruining the towns, the barbarian invasions destroyed the conditions of civilized life and threw the population back into a semi-barbarous state, depopulating even the frontier zone, which was repopled by the invaders. It split up the territory of the Empire into a number of rulerships, each exercised by a barbarian king governing both his own people and his Latin-speaking subjects, known as Romans. Though distinct for three centuries, the two populations ultimately became fused in nations whose territory has retained the name of its barbarian king: France, England, Scotland, Lombardy, Catalonia. At the same time the Christian religion, long confined to the people of the towns, gradually spread among the country population and extended to part of the Barbarian peoples, whom it

brought within the scope of religious unity under the authority of the pope of Rome.

The most powerful rulership, that of the king of the Franks, established over Gaul and part of Germany, had grown weaker during the lapse of two centuries, and was reorganized by a new family of rulers. Charlemagne, a Frankish king, united part of Europe, revived the title of Emperor, and established a government based upon personal relations by applying to the army and high offices the new custom of war service rendered to their lord by vassals. He created institutions which were to serve as a model to all princes for centuries: the great offices of State, tithes, the oath of honour which transformed great persons into vassals of the sovereign, and collaboration between the lay and ecclesiastical powers. He stimulated a revival of Latin studies which restored the use of legible writing and correct language and saved the works of Latin antiquity.

When his Empire was dismembered by his descendants, authority split up into small rulerships, and the army into small bands of horsemen; and the habit of giving possession of a domain as a fief to a vassal doing military service led to the foundation of the feudal system in France, whence it gradually spread to most countries. At the same time, from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, in the vast almost unpopulated regions, the Scandinavian and Slav peoples became concentrated into nations under the power of hereditary war leaders, who ended by becoming converted to Christianity and brought their peoples into the unity of religion. Those of the north and centre came under the authority of the Roman Church; but the Russians and most of the southern Slavs rallied to the "Orthodox" Church of Constantinople, and Europe became divided between two rival creeds.

A period of disorder lasting for two centuries, aggravated by the incursions of pagans (Normans, Saracens, and Hungarians), who devastated and pillaged the West and centre of Europe, came to an end in the eleventh century, when society became reorganized and the foundations were laid for the political, social, economic, and intellectual life of the European peoples, which was henceforth to undergo no change except through a continuous evolution. It was created by custom and the inheritance of property, power, and social position and became organized under authorities of varying origin: that of the king over the people, that of the great landowner over the peasants

Conclusion

who were tenants on his domain, and the duties, dues, and compulsory labour of the peasants. The feudal system regulated the rights and duties of lord and vassal respectively. It was introduced into England by the Conquest, from thence into Scotland, and later into Germany and Italy.

In every country mounted fighting men formed the upper class, known as the nobility, to which even the kings belonged. It owned the land and power and lived in fortified castles. In the thirteenth century it became inordinately increased by absorbing the esquires, mere armed attendants owning a fief and living in fortified houses, who were henceforth known as gentlemen. Nobility created new sentiments and a morality which remained peculiar to Europe — the sentiment and rules of personal “honour” — while at the courts of princes it gave rise to “courtesy” and “gallantry” to ladies, which began to raise the status of women in the privileged world.

The clergy constituted another upper class, on an equality with the nobility, from which were recruited the bishops and abbots, who owned vast domains and were the king’s vassals and the lords of the warriors forming their train. They had begun to “reform” themselves by restoring the rule in the monasteries, forbidding the marriage of priests, and making the pope independent of lay princes. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they greatly increased their power over the laity by founding the officialities, the Inquisition, and the new monastic orders dwelling in contact with believers in the towns. In the thirteenth century the pope, having grown powerful enough to go to war with the emperor three times, put forward a claim to make the clergy an “independent society,” and even asserted his right to depose kings. Instruction by the clergy in Latin, according to the tradition of the Roman schools, was organized in Paris in the form of the University, at which was created the system of faculties, colleges, examinations, and degrees which has remained in use throughout the whole of Europe.

A class grew up in the repopulated or recently created towns, and especially in the formerly barbarian lands in the centre of Europe, which had no analogy in the antique world and was intermediate between the nobles and peasants: the *bourgeoisie*, including craftsmen and merchants (grouped into craft guilds in the more energetic countries), the owners of houses and land, and even, in the richer towns of

Conclusion

Italy and the south, the neighbouring nobles. Certain towns became sovereign republics, but most of them had a government subject to the lord of the town. The Italian commercial towns invented modes of procedure which have remained the foundation of the modern economic system: banks, bills of exchange, partnership, insurance, commercial and maritime law, and, later, book-keeping by double entry, and calculation by means of the Arabic numerals. It was the towns of Italy that set the example of employing "legists" learned in the Roman law as judges. This usage, introduced into all countries, had as its result the creation of a growing class of "men of law," which swelled the bourgeoisie and greatly increased its power.

The civilization growing up in the towns produced a new religious architecture, a literature in the vernacular, and technical inventions which increased industrial production. It began to accumulate wealth in the new form.

The political power of the king was concentrated and strengthened in the lands of the west and north, where a hereditary royal family united a whole region under its rule: France, England, Scotland, the three Scandinavian kingdoms, and, after the conquests from the Moslems in Spain, the kingdoms of Portugal, Castile, and Aragon; while in Central Europe the conflict between the Pope and the German King — who had become Emperor since the tenth century — led to the break-up of Italy and Germany into independent territories. In eastern Europe disputes between foreign princes over the succession had given the nobles a means of rendering the power of the king merely nominal.

Up to the fourteenth century the power of the king, in theory undefined, had in reality continued to be limited by the weakness of his means of action and the competing powers of the lords and prelates. An exception was England, where, after the Conquest, the king was strong enough to prevent his lords from making war among themselves and subject them to his ordinances and courts of law. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the authority of sovereigns, whether kings or princes, was strengthened by new means of action, created almost simultaneously in different countries. These were: armies serving for pay for an unlimited period of time; taxation, at first for the expenses of the army, for which the revenues of the royal domain no longer sufficed; assemblies of notables (lords, nobles,

Conclusion

clergy, and bourgeois), summoned by the prince to approve some exceptional decision and serving mainly to sanction the raising of taxes, now the Government's principal resource; the new organization of justice, administered by professional judges assisted by men of law, and secret procedure initiated by the judicial authorities in criminal causes, which gave the Government means of arresting and indefinitely detaining anyone who seemed to it suspect. The authority of the clergy had been weakened by the migration of the pope to Avignon, and still more by the Great Schism, discontent with the fiscal procedure of the Holy See, the relaxation of discipline, and finally, in the fifteenth century, the failure of the "reforming" councils.

Practical life was beginning to be transformed by a series of inventions, the fulling-mill, the spinning-wheel, paper, the plane, the clock, and, in the fifteenth century, gunpowder and printing, and large-scale industry was beginning to employ the masters of the craft guilds as hired labourers.

The modern period opened towards the end of the fifteenth century with the upheaval in men's minds caused by the discovery of America and the route to India, which made known to Europe a new world and foreign civilizations strange to Christianity, changed the great trade routes, and prepared the way for the conquest of vast colonial empires.

The Renaissance, which in literature started as early as the fourteenth century at Florence, and in painting as early as the fifteenth century in Italy and Flanders, began to permeate other countries, where it produced original masterpieces which were to remain models for the cultivated public in the whole of Europe.

Humanism, born of the study of the authors of antiquity, and applied to the text of the Holy Scriptures for the purpose of seeking Revelation in them, raised the practical question of salvation, which concerned all believers and prepared the way for the Reformation. This was carried out through a revolt against the authority of the pope analogous to the heresies of the Middle Ages, and ended in the formation of independent Churches. Henceforward the lay governments, empowered to choose between competing Churches, decided the religion of their subjects according to their own will and took advantage of this to keep the clergy dependent upon them.

The Churches known as "Protestant" were organized separately

Conclusion

in every territory, first — in Germany, Switzerland, the Scandinavian kingdoms, and England — by order of the prince, and later — in Scotland, France, and the Netherlands — by the revolt of his subjects. The struggle between the Churches took the form of revolts against the Catholic sovereigns, which, reinforced by the aid given to those in revolt by the Protestant princes, led to the civil wars of religion, followed by an attempt at domination on the part of the King of Spain, which ended in his definitive defeat.

The Roman Church, having carried out a reform while maintaining tradition and restoring discipline among the clergy, retained the greater part of Europe, dividing Germany and the Netherlands with the Protestant Churches.

Economic life was transformed by trade with the Far East and the working of the silver mines of America, whence came an influx of money which led to a rise in prices and permitted the accumulation of currency necessary for providing business enterprises with capital. This activity gave rise to commercial exchanges, deposit banks, and companies enjoying a monopoly, and later to trade in colonial produce — sugar, coffee, and tobacco — and the slave-trade, which was to become one of the principal sources of profit to the ports in the eighteenth century.

The older form of landed wealth belonging to the nobility and clergy began to feel the competition of the new wealth, other than in land, acquired by the bourgeoisie through trade, banking, army contracts, and financial transactions with the governments. It was used by the bourgeois to purchase land or office enabling them to enter the nobility, and in France to acquire employment in the public service, sold in the form of offices. The nobles, who were ceasing more and more to be fighting men and whom their education rendered unsuitable for gainful occupations and public employment, led an idle life in the country, where their castles had ceased to be fortresses; the richest of them had their mansions in town and frequented the courts of princes. This transformation did not take place in eastern Europe, where, in the absence of towns, it was impossible to create a bourgeoisie.

The monarchy, already absolute in the sixteenth century, became in the seventeenth century so impersonal that the king was able to delegate all his authority to a minister, who governed in his stead. He

Conclusion

ceased to be a war leader and became the head of a state served by officials, almost all of them bourgeois. He now lived in a permanent residence, surrounded by a court of nobles, at which his life was regulated by ceremonial.

Only two small states, the Swiss Confederation and the United Provinces, continued to be confederations of very small republics, united by a permanent alliance, without any central government, and for the most part governed by the richer bourgeois. By its commerce and wealth Holland had gained the political leadership of the United Provinces and the position of a great power.

Relations between states came to be organized on the model set up by the sovereign towns of Italy, in the form of diplomacy inspired by a spirit of "Machiavellianism," which disguises under the externals of Italian politeness a policy of interest, cunning, and violence. The armies charged with defending this policy ceased to be bands recruited and led by private contractors and became permanent standing armies, equipped and provisioned by governments and led by professional officers who were agents of the prince. In the eighteenth century the infantry, armed with the flintlock and bayonet, became the principal arm. The attempt of the house of Austria to dominate the German princes was checked by the intervention of the kings of Sweden and France, which confirmed the splitting up of power in Germany. The King of France's policy of domination was checked by England, which based European policy on a "balance" of power between the great states.

Economic life was beginning to be transformed in two countries. Holland created a model of intensive agriculture and cattle-breeding which the English were beginning to imitate. In England the textile and metal industries, concentrated in big concerns, employed hired operatives, working chiefly at home. Part of these lived under precarious conditions in the country, for governments forbade wage-earners to form associations or strike, and even fixed a maximum wage. Sea-borne trade, banking, and mining came to be organized in limited-liability companies with a capital independent of the person of those associated in them. Governments, desirous of increasing their power through the wealth of their subjects, took measures to keep money in the country or attract it there by the devices of the "mercantilist school": embargoes, customs duties, monopolies, and subsidies.

Conclusion

The sciences, which had ceased to make progress since Greek antiquity, had been given a fresh impetus through the work of a few isolated men of learning, working by means of mathematics, observation, and experiment with novel instruments.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century a Tsar of Russia, fascinated by the material civilization of the West, imposed upon the Russian people the methods of European technique and the institutions of absolute monarchies, and transformed Russian society by making the owners of estates equivalent to nobles, and the peasants to serfs. His Empire, possessing a vast territory and a strong army, now took rank among the great powers.

The new kingdom of Prussia, by devoting all its resources to its army, was becoming a great power at the expense of Austria and Poland. Science and technical methods continued to progress, especially during the second half of the century, and material prosperity increased in the whole of Europe.

In Great Britain the two revolutions in the seventeenth century, which originated in religious conflicts between the king and his subjects, and the succession to the throne of a new and foreign dynasty, led to the creation of a system in England which caused power to pass from the king to representatives of the privileged classes, independent of the Government.

“Natural religion,” the way for which had been prepared as early as the seventeenth century by the tacit toleration of Dissenters in Holland and England, became organized into a system in the eighteenth century. It dispelled the fear of hell, rejected asceticism, miracles, and the idea that salvation was confined to a single Church, and replaced the dualistic and pessimistic doctrine of Christianity by an optimistic faith in a kindly, benevolent God who has given man reason in order that he might seek for happiness. It spread among writers and the ruling classes and at first inspired religious toleration, humanitarian sentiment, and confidence in the laws of nature as applied to economic affairs. It was accepted by conservatives and ministers and, when combined with absolutism, constituted “enlightened despotism.” In the aristocratic lodges of the Freemasons it next assumed the form of free thought and the cult of reason and humanitarianism, and afterwards it led men to regard the political and social system established by tradition as a mass of abuses.

Conclusion

The French Revolution, inspired by these sentiments, began by establishing a system which, while retaining the monarchy, caused the government to pass into the hands of the nation, represented by its elected mandataries. But the resistance of the nobility and clergy and the war entered upon against foreign monarchies soon led them to establish a republic, which, after many years of internal struggle, finally did away with elections and created a strongly centralized government.

The French armies carried the Revolution into the whole of central and southern Europe, where the domination of Napoleon destroyed social privileges and established centralized governments on the French model, which realized the ideal of enlightened despotism by granting religious toleration and private liberty to their subjects, while in many countries foreign occupation began to give rise to a national sentiment. The political and social upheaval which weakened the nobility and clergy, diminishing their numbers and power, multiplied and elevated the bourgeoisie by increasing its wealth and influence in public office, and improved the condition of the peasants, as well as, to some extent, of craftsmen. It did not affect society either in Great Britain or in Russia.

The victory of the great powers allied against Napoleon re-established the balance of Europe and restored the former sovereigns without setting up the old social system again. Following the English example, the French monarchy accepted a liberal constitutional system, which, after the Paris Revolution of 1830, was transformed into a parliamentary system directed by the bourgeoisie. The two great liberal states supported the creation of the kingdom of Belgium and the introduction into Spain and Portugal of the forms of constitutional monarchy, under which generals contended for power in the name of the conflicting political parties; while in the rest of Europe the three absolute monarchies repressed liberal or national agitations.

The new technical methods of industry, due to the machines invented in England during the last thirty years of the eighteenth century and transported into the industrial regions of the Continent during the nineteenth, produced an abundance of articles of consumption which made life easier. But by bringing together growing numbers of wage-earners in large establishments it was beginning to create a class of workmen without any stable position in society, living on a precarious wage at the mercy of the employers and exposed to fre-

Conclusion

quent periods of unemployment resulting from periodical crises in the market. In France and England their wretched condition gave rise to Socialist doctrines and projects, which were afterwards put into action by a policy of class conflict and social revolution.

The Revolution of 1848, which arose out of an agitation for electoral reform in France, stirred up a rising in all the states of central Europe, which was at once liberal, democratic, and national, but was soon checked by a military and social reaction which restored the old system, consolidating it by police and repressive measures, and in France by the establishment of an Imperial monarchy. But the governments of the three states which had preserved part of the Revolution in the form of universal suffrage or a constitution — the French Empire and the kingdoms of Prussia and Sardinia — stirred up a series of wars among the great powers which brought about the foundation of the unity of Italy and Germany and compelled governments to carry out great internal reforms: the liberation of the serfs in Russia, the organization of the constitutional Empire in Austria-Hungary, the liberal Empire and, later, the democratic parliamentary Republic in France. England, which alone had stood apart from the wars, determined upon an electoral reform which admitted the workers to political life, while the affiliation of their unions provided them with an effective means of action through regulating the conditions of labour.

After the middle of the nineteenth century material life was transformed with increasing rapidity by the influx of gold and the rapid growth of the metal industries, railways, limited-liability companies, and credit establishments. These forms of progress were profitable chiefly to the bourgeoisie, which increased in numbers, wealth, and social importance and, except in eastern Europe, became the equals of the nobility. The sciences completed their organization on a system which began to permeate men's minds and unsettle their religious ideas.

During a long period of peace, political life in every state but the Russian Empire became consolidated into a constitutional system which recognized the political rights of subjects (or citizens) and allowed political opposition to the Government in the Chambers and the press. It tended to follow the "parliamentary" practice of responsible ministries, for which the more advanced states set the ex-

Conclusion

ample. Parties were formed everywhere under the same names and with similar programs, and the Socialist parties in the different states even ended by uniting in an international organization, which imposed the same tactics of social revolution upon all. But a great difference in the actual system remained between those countries in which political liberty was supported by public opinion and those in which the people had not learned to devise checks for arbitrary government. The balance between the great powers, broken by the preponderance of the German Empire and the Triple Alliance, was re-established by the Triple Entente.

Material life was revolutionized by the systematic application of the sciences to technical methods, and by the exploitation of the deposits of material accumulated in the earth and of the vast territories outside Europe, colonized or exploited by Europeans, who stimulated agricultural and industrial production and the means of communication, trade, and credit. An economic activity without precedent in the history of the world provided the population with a constantly increasing quantity of goods of every kind. Mass production at low prices brought these within the reach of the mass of manual labourers and brought their standard of living closer to that of the bourgeoisie. The prodigious growth of credit gave the directors of great companies a powerful means of influencing not only industry and commerce, but the State finances and Government policy, thus tending to constitute an oligarchy of financiers. Yet the conventional distinctions between classes became less marked. The relations between people of different social position was tending towards equality, and manners had become milder. This progress produced a very unequal effect according to the condition of the various peoples, but the differences remained great between the more advanced countries in the west and north and the more backward ones in southern and eastern Europe.

The catastrophe resulting from the war revolutionized the whole life of Europe. It destroyed all the empires and liberated the small nations, which constituted themselves into national states. But the liberal system of government introduced for a while into all states has maintained itself only among those peoples genuinely accustomed to political liberty. It has been replaced by an authoritarian system possessing means of repression which place the lives and fortunes of all subjects at the mercy of the Government. Deficits, inflation, the col-

Conclusion

lapse of currencies, and the return to mercantilist practices have upset both the public finances and private fortunes and thrown men's minds into a confusion which finds expression in the fanaticism of extremist parties and an abundance of economic theories.

When we try to sum up the general features in that series of transformations which has led up to the present state of Europe, they present themselves as follows: all authorities which have organized the relations between men have originally been created by compulsion, in the form either of war, material punishments, or the fear of supernatural powers; but when long continued and become habitual, compulsion has been felt to be like a law of nature. The result has been a growing inequality between those who command and those who obey, between ruler and subject, man and woman, master and servant.

The very poor yield of agriculture kept almost the whole population on the land, producing the materials indispensable for the life of the whole people, and imposed upon it a mode of life making it unfit for innovations. It was only in the towns, the centres of government and trade, that the conditions of civilized life were created by technical inventions, the discoveries of science, and the rules of moral conduct.

Civilized life, economic, political, social, and intellectual, became organized very slowly at various periods in different countries — soonest in regions with a warm climate and nearest to the East, and last of all in eastern Europe, which for a long time was almost unpopulated. But this process went on everywhere by analogous methods and in similar forms, arising out of conditions common to all peoples and, still more, from imitation of the same innovations, made, as the result of exceptional conditions, in a small number of centres: Athens, Rome, and afterwards in certain towns in Italy, France, the Netherlands, England, and Germany.

This transformation took place through an analogous progress in the different spheres of activity, starting from a personal, concrete, local, and varied course of action, and arriving at an impersonal, abstract, general, and uniform system. In politics it started with the personal command of the ruler, only to lead to the anonymous rule of the State, organized everywhere in the same forms. Economically it started from the individual craft, learned through personal apprenticeship, and led up to the limited-liability company, operating with

Conclusion

an abstract capital according to a uniform technique. In religion it started from the personal relation of the believer to a local divine power, and led up to a universal abstract religion with a single God. In science it began with personal reflexion and ended in an impersonal, abstract science, working by uniform methods. In economic affairs it started from the individual barter of articles and ended in the uniform operations of an impersonal and anonymous credit.

In recent times progress in agricultural technique and the influx of goods from other continents have changed the proportion between the various elements of the population, greatly decreasing that of the country districts, occupied in agriculture, and increasing that of the towns, occupied in industry and trade and, to a growing extent, in public employment.

During modern times the upsetting of the conceptions upon which conduct is based has led to a religious and political revolution which has ended in relaxing compulsion by authority in government, society, and the family and has created a system of political and economic liberty in the most civilized part of Europe. In lands where political experience was insufficient, the catastrophe resulting from the war has led to a retrograde movement towards systems based upon compulsion.

Yet nothing points to a decline in the vital force of Europe. We see a growth of population and production in every department and a multiplication of inventions and discoveries, of works of literature and the arts. But progress is so rapid that the peoples have not yet had time to adapt themselves to it.

INDEX

- Abélard, 174
 Academy, French, 285
 Advertising, commercial, 297, 397
 Agamemnon, 12
 Agnosticism, 396
 Agriculture: in ancient Europe, 20-1; in Greece, 28; in ninth century, 98-100; in Middle Ages, 137, 196-8; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 247-8, 259, 278; government regulation of, 254; eighteenth century, 294, 324; nineteenth century, 334, 337, 360; twentieth century, 381, 382, 390, 415-16, 419
 Albertus Magnus, 175
 Alexander, King of Macedonia, 29-30, 72, 423
 Alexander I, Tsar, 330
 Alexander II, Tsar, 354, 373
 Alexander III, Tsar, 379
 Alexandria, Library of, 31
 Alfred, King of Wessex, 109
 Alpine race, 8
 Alva, Duke of, 232
Amadis of Gaul, 210
 America, discovery and settlement of, 246, 247, 249
 Anabaptists, 221
 Anau, 10
 Anglican Church, 224, 236, 258, 268, 273, 287, 288, 396
 Anthropology, and European races, 7, 8-9
 Arabic numerals, 201
 Architecture, 40, 162-3, 210-11, 215, 263, 347-8, 420
 Ariosto, 214
 Aristotle, 174
 Army: privileged class in ancient Europe, 22-3; Roman, 34-5, 46, 47, 48-9, 66; under Charlemagne, 90, 95; disintegration of, 105-6; in Middle Ages, 138-41, 205-6; standing, origin of, 186-7; fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, 243-4, 276-7; eighteenth century, 292-3; changes in French, during Revolution, 314-15; of Napoleon, 318-19; reform of German, 321; nineteenth century, 353; twentieth century, 378
 Art: Greek, 32-3; Roman, 40-1, 50; mediæval, 162-3; Renaissance, 213-15; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 263; eighteenth century, 306; after French Revolution, 326; nineteenth century, 347-8; twentieth century, 397-8, 420
 Arts: creation of, 30-3; Renaissance of, 213-15
 Aryan race, 407
 Assemblies, representative: growth of, 183-5; part played by, 185-6; in French Revolution, 309-13; nineteenth century, 329, 331-2, 355, 356, 357-8; twentieth century, 404
Astrée, 263
 Atheism, 284, 304, 420
 Augsburg Confession, 222
 Augustus, 37
 Austro-Prussian War, 355
 Autarchy, 413
 Authority: different kinds of (ninth to eleventh centuries), 115-17; private, of landowner, 117-20, 133; of clergy, 133; forms of (eleventh to thirteenth centuries), 133-46; of king, 133; changes in secular (late Middle Ages), 178-82, 193; changes in ecclesiastical, 182-3, 193, 273-4; changes in governmental, 271-2, 274-6; becomes absolute and impersonal, 289
 Averroes, 174
 Avicenna, 174
 Bach, 286, 306
 Balzac, 347
 Bank of England, 279, 297
 Banks, 160-1, 200, 250, 297, 336, 362, 384, 411, 413, 421
 Baptists, 221
 Barbarians, 20; invade Roman Empire, 46, 63, 65-72; effects of, on Empire, 69-77; form nations, 101; fresh invasions of, 103-5

Index

- Basel, Council of, 183
 Bastille, 310
 Bayeux tapestry, 126
 Bede, 63
 Béguines, 208
 Benedict, St., 80-1, 96, 124
 Benedictines, 80-1, 96, 124
Beowulf, 162
 Bernard, St., 164
 Bessemer process, 361
 Bible, translations of, 208, 209, 216
 Bill of exchange, 200
 Bismarck, 352, 355, 378, 379, 421
 Blackstone, William, 288
 Blockade, Continental, 320, 321, 322, 324, 325
 Boccaccio, 210
 Boileau, 286
 Boleslaw, 121
 Bologna, University of, 174, 191
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, *see* Napoleon I
 Boniface, St., 86
 Boniface VIII, Pope, 171
 Book-keeping, 201, 250
 Bourbon, house of, 332
 Bourgeois, 203-4, 207; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 257-8, 283; eighteenth century, 288, 299, 301, 302; benefited by French Revolution, 323, 325; nineteenth century, 340, 342, 366-7; twentieth century, 388-9, 392, 417-18
 Bridget, St., 208
 Brokers, 250, 297
 Bronze Age, 11-12, 19, 26
 Brothers of the Common Life, 208
 Buffon, 306

 Cabinets, 271, 288
 Cæsar, Julius, 19, 37
 Calvin, 218, 219, 220-1, 222-3, 224, 226, 262
 Camaldulians, 164
 Canute, 109
 Capetian dynasty, 106
 Capital, 252, 279, 386
 Capitularies, 87, 102
 Capuchins, 226
 Cardano, 249
 Carpentry, improvements in, 194
 Cartels, 385
 Carthusians, 164
 Cathars, 168, 208-9
 Catherine II, Empress of Russia, 291, 292
 Catherine de' Medici, 231, 232
 Catherine of Siena, St., 208
 Catholic Princes, League of, 234, 235
 Cavour, 352
 Cervantes, 214, 263
Chansons de geste, 162
 Charity, 305
 Charlemagne, 87-94, 101, 106, 108, 109, 110, 116, 127, 425
 Charles V, Emperor, 230, 231
 Charles I, King of England, 236, 238, 268
 Charles II, King of England, 268
 Charles V, King of France, 189
 Charles VIII, King of France, 230
 Charles IX, King of France, 231, 232
 Charles II, King of Spain, 267
 Charles X, King of Sweden, 265-6
 Charles XI, King of Sweden, 271
 Charles XII, King of Sweden, 270, 277-8
 Charles d'Orléans, 210
 Charles Martel, 86, 87
 Charles the Bald, 94
 Chartists, 333, 346
 Chateaubriand, 325
 Chaucer, 210
 Christianity: introduction of, 45, 51; precursors of, 52-4; origins of 54-6; established in Europe, 56-7; revolutionizes religious habits, 60-1; permeates Europe, 62, 77, 79, 81-3, 88, 120-3; change in character of, 77; unity of, broken, 78, 79; mediæval beliefs and practices of, 171-3; beliefs and practices of, sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 261-2, 284; views of, nineteenth century, 343; twentieth century, 395-6, 420; *and see* Church, Religion
 Church: unity of, 57, 60-1, 120; organization of, in cities, 57-9; schism in, 122-3; growth of power of, 166-8; rules of, 167; Great Schism in, 182-3, 208; need of reformation in, 183; and Protestant Reformation, 216-26; relations with states, 242-3; separated from State in France, 376; *and see* Christianity, Roman Catholic Church
 Cicero, 40, 214
 Cistercians, 164
 City state, Greek: system of, 26-8
 Classes, relations between (twentieth century), 392-4
 Clergy: under Charlemagne, 91-2, 93, 96-7; authority of, 120, 133, 170-1, 182-3, 273-4; crisis among (ninth to eleventh centuries), 123-4; attempts to reform, 124-5; changes in, 164-6; influence of, on laity, 173; influence of, on arts, 176;

Index

-
- at end of Middle Ages, 207-8; and Reformation, 216-18, 229; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 258-9; eighteenth century, 301, 303, 304, 309; and French Revolution, 311, 321, 322, 323, 325; nineteenth century, 332, 340-1, 368; twentieth century, 395, 396
 - Clermont, Council of, 129
 - Clocks, 194
 - Clovis, 73, 74, 79
 - Cluniacs, 124-5, 164
 - Colbert, 279, 280
 - Columban, St., 82
 - Columbus, 247
 - Commerce, *see* Trade
 - Communist Manifesto*, 346
 - Communists, 346, 404, 405-6, 413-14, 416, 420, 421
 - Compass, 195
 - Comte, Auguste, 368
 - Confraternities, 208, 259
 - Conscription, 314, 315, 318, 351, 378, 400
 - Constance, Council of, 183, 209
 - Constantine 47, 48, 56-7; Donation of, 170
 - Constantinople, 47, 69, 70, 85; captured by crusaders, 129-30; captured by Turks, 178
 - Constitutions, written, 311, 312, 315, 321, 328-9, 333, 350, 352, 355, 356-8, 371
 - Consuls, 160
 - Contract system, 295-6
 - Corneille, 214, 263
 - Cossacks, 266
 - Counter-Reformation, 226-7, 259
 - Court, 89, 141, 272; of Napoleon I, 317
 - Courtesy, 145-6, 210
 - Craftsmen, origin of, 152-3; *and see* Guilds
 - Credit, 297-8, 336, 362-3, 384-5
 - Crimean War, 352, 353-4
 - Cromwell, Oliver, 264-5
 - Crusades, 129, 131-2, 161, 168
 - Customs duties, 281, 298, 336, 361-2, 379, 412-13

 - Dancing, 206, 342
 - Danelagh, 103
 - Dante, 210
 - David, King of the Jews, 55, 173
 - David, Jacques Louis, 326
 - Debt, public, 377, 402, 409, 411, 413
 - Declaration of Independence*, American, 308
 - Deism, 285, 303
 - Demosthenes, 40

 - Descartes, 262, 286
 - Dickens, 347
 - Dictatorships, since the World War, 405-8
 - Diderot, 306
 - Dies Irae*, 176
 - Diocletian, 47
 - Diplomacy: origins of, 244-5; seventeenth century, 276, 278; eighteenth century, 293-4
 - Discoveries, effects of, on European life, 246-7
 - Domesday Book*, 135
 - Dominic, St., 169
 - Dominicans, 169

 - East India Company, 252, 279
 - Eckhardt, 208
 - École Polytechnique, 325
 - Economic crisis, following the World War, 408-15
 - Economic life: in Middle Ages, 195-6; acted upon by governments, 252-5, 408-9; *and see* Industry, Trade
 - Education, 21, 41, 44; under Late Roman Empire, 51; under Charlemagne, 92-3; under Alfred, 109; mediæval, 173-6; 209-10; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 262, 274; nineteenth century, 340, 368-9; twentieth century, 397; in Fascist Italy, 406-7
 - Edward VI, King of England, 224
 - Edward the Confessor, 109
 - Electoral system, 357
 - Elizabeth, Queen of England, 224, 231, 232, 233, 238
 - England: concentration of power in, 108-9; political crisis in (seventeenth century), 264-5, 268-9, 270
 - Enlightened despotism, 291-2, 323
 - Erasmus, 218
 - Ethnography, and periods of European civilization, 7-12
 - Etiquette, 272
 - Eugene, Prince, 277-8
 - Europe: origin and significance of name, 3; geographical and physical conditions of, 3-7; races of, 7, 8-9
 - Evangelical Lutheran Church, 222

 - Fairs, 159, 198, 250
 - Farel, 222
 - Fascists, 406-7, 414
 - Ferdinand I, Emperor, 230
 - Feudal system, 90-1, 139-40; origins of, 118-20; place of clergy in, 123; intro-

Index

- Jesus, Society of, *see* Jesuits
 Jews, 54–5, 260, 394, 397, 407
 John, King of England, 130
 Jordanes, 63
 Joseph II, Emperor, 292
 Judicial system: changes in (late Middle Ages), 190–3; fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, 241–2, 274–5
 Justice: among barbarians, 116–17; eleventh to thirteenth centuries, 133–4; *and see* Judicial system, Law

 Kant, 325
 Kepler, 262
 Khammurabi, Laws of, 29
 Kilian, St., 82
 Knights Hospitallers, 131
 Knights of the Sword, 177

 Labour: in ninth century, 97; organization of, in Middle Ages, 195–6, 197, 202; government regulation of, 252–4, 278, 282; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 259–60, 282–3; eighteenth century, 294–5, 299–301; after French Revolution, 324–5; nineteenth century, 334–5, 338–9, 364–5; laws for protection of, 346; twentieth century, 389–90, 391, 406, 411, 418
 La Fontaine, 286
 Languages of Europe: origin of, 12–14, 19, 25, 68, 69; literary, 210
 Lateran Council, 169
 Latin, 39, 41, 70, 92–3, 173, 176, 214, 262, 278
 Latitudinarians, 262
 Lavoisier, 306
 Law: Roman, 39, 43–4, 75, 157, 191–3; transformation in, 74–6; becomes profession, 157–8, 190; commercial, 160; canon, 167; statute, 184; common, 184; and custom, 191–2; *and see* Justice
 Law, John, 297
 League of Nations, 408
 Lefebvre, 222
 Leibnitz, 286
 Leo III, Pope, 88
 Leonardo da Vinci, 213
 Leopold II, Emperor, 272, 292
 Liberalism, present-day, 420–1
 Linguistics, and languages of Europe, 8, 12–14
 Linnæus, 306
 Literature: Greek, 32, 33, 40; Roman, 40–1, 50–1, 92–3; of Middle Ages, 162, 210, 212; Renaissance, 214, 215; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 263, 286; eighteenth century, 306; after French Revolution, 325; nineteenth century, 347, 368; twentieth century, 397
Lives of the Saints, 54, 63
 Living-conditions: in ancient Europe, 10–11, 20–1; under Rome, 42–3; of Slavs, 68; ninth to eleventh centuries, 125–6; of peasants in Middle Ages, 137, 194, 202; seventeenth century, 278–9, 282–4; eighteenth century, 298–301; nineteenth century, 339, 341–2, 365–7; twentieth century, 380–2, 389, 390–2, 419–20
 Locke, John, 285
 Lombards, 85, 88
 Lothair, Emperor, 94, 106, 107
 Louis XII, King of France, 230–1
 Louis XIII, King of France, 238
 Louis XIV, King of France, 267–8, 269, 270, 272, 274, 276, 277, 286, 293
 Louis XVI, King of France, 311–12
 Louis Napoleon, *see* Napoleon III
 Louis Philippe, King of France, 334
 Louis the German, 94
 Louis the Pious, 94
 Love, change in conception of, 146
 Loyola, Ignatius de, 226–7
 Loyseau, 255
 Lulli, 286
 Luther, Martin, 209, 218, 219–20, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226

 Macadam, 335
 Machiavelli, 245, 278, 421
 Magna Carta, 130, 196
 Malherbe, 214
 Manichæan heresy, 168
 Marcus Aurelius, 220
 Marlborough, Duke of, 277–8
 Marx, Karl, 346, 373, 404
 Marxism, 396, 416
 Mary, Queen of England, 224
 Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, 231, 232
 Materialism, 304
 Matthias, Archduke, 234
 Maximian, 47
 Mazarin, Cardinal, 238, 265, 267
 Mediterranean race, 8
 Menander, 40
 Mercantile system, 254
 Mercantilist school of political economy, 281, 298, 336, 412
 Merchants: origin of, 152–3; guilds of, 155; associations of, 251
 Methodists, 303

Index

- Michelangelo, 213
 Middle classes, *see* Bourgeois
 Migration of peoples, 14–18, 65–6, 67, 68
 Military orders, 131
 Milton, 286
 Minorities, national, 375, 377, 401
 Minos, King of Crete, 12
 Modernism, Roman Catholic, 396
 Molière, 286
 Monastic orders, 124–5, 164, 169; secularization of property of, 311, 340
 Money, 160, 199–200, 362–3; export of, forbidden, 253, 336, 414; and power, 280–2; depreciation in value of, 402, 403, 409, 412, 416
 Mongols, invade Europe, 130
 Monks, 59–60, 80–1, 96, 164, 169, 207–8; attempt to reform clergy, 124–5
 Montaigne, 214
 Montesquieu, 288, 303, 306
 Moslems, 84, 85, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 128–9, 130, 132, 171, 255, 338
 Mozart, 306
 Music: mediæval, 176; Renaissance, 214–15; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 263, 286; eighteenth century, 306; after French Revolution, 326; nineteenth century, 348, 369; twentieth century, 397–8, 420
 Mycenæ, 11, 12, 26
 Mysticism, 208

 Nantes, Edict of, revocation of, 267–8, 273
 Napoleon I, 316–24, 327–30, 338, 353, 396, 432; his domination in Europe, 319–24
 Napoleon III, 352, 353, 354, 356, 361
 Napoleonic Wars, 318–22, 324
 National Socialists, 407, 414
 Nationalism, 355, 375, 396–7, 400, 403, 407
 Natural religion, 302–4, 396; effects of, 304–6, 420, 431
 Navigation, progress in, 195, 249; *and see* Transport
 Neolithic period, 10, 14, 19, 24
 Newton, Isaac, 286
 Nicæa, Council of, 57, 59, 78
 Nicholas II, Tsar, 380
 Nobility: Roman, 36, 45, 48; after barbarian invasions, 76; in ninth century, 95–7; formation of, in Middle Ages, 138–41, 204–7; degrees of, 141–4; life of, 144–5, 206–7; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 255–7, 260, 261, 283–4; eighteenth century, 290, 301–2, 308, 309; after French Revolution, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325; nineteenth century, 340, 343, 366; twentieth century, 388, 417
 Nordic race, 8–9, 63, 71, 103, 111
 North German Federation, 355
 Northmen, 102–3

 Oath of fealty, 116, 118
 Odo, 106
 Officers, League of (Greece), 376
 Olaf II, King of Norway, 112
 Olga, Princess, 122
 Opposition to government, types of, 330–2, 349–51, 373, 375
 Orange-Nassau, house of, 239
 Oratorians, 226
 Orthodox Church, 120, 122–3, 395
 Otto I, Emperor, 110, 124
 Ottoman Turks, capture Constantinople, 178
 Owen, Robert, 346

 Painting, 211, 213–14, 263, 306, 326, 348, 369, 420
 Palæolithic period, 10
 Palestrina, 215
 Paris, Congress of, 353–4
 Paris, University of, 174, 175, 209
 Parties, political, growth of, 344, 359, 370–2; international, 373–5
 Passports, 410, 413
 Paulus Diaconus, 63
 Peasants: origin of, 95, 97; legal status of, 117–18; eleventh to thirteenth centuries, 135–8, 147; in Middle Ages, 196, 201–2; revolt of (sixteenth century), 221; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 259, 260–1, 282; eighteenth century, 294, 299–300, 309; after French Revolution, 323–4, 325; nineteenth century, 334, 337–8, 351, 364–5; twentieth century, 390, 406, 414, 416, 418–19
 Pelagius, 77
 Pelayo, 107
 Pepin, 87
 Peter the Great, Tsar, 270–1, 272, 276, 290–1, 300
 Peter's pence, 170
 Petrarch, 210
 Philip II, King of Spain, 233, 238
 Philip Augustus, King of France, 129, 130
Philosophes, 303, 304, 308
 Physiocracy, 304
 Pietist movement, 303
 Pindar, 40
 Pius IX, Pope, 373

Index

- Pius X, Pope, 396
 Plautus, 40, 51
 Pléiade, 214
 Pliny the Younger, 51
 Poland: partition of, 293-4; second partition of, 316
 Police, 190, 289-90, 407, 413
 Political economy, 280-2, 374
 Political organization: in ancient Europe, 21-3, 25; of Greek city state, 27-8; of Roman people, 33-4; of Roman Empire, 37-9, 47-50; after barbarian invasions, 72-4; eleventh to thirteenth centuries, 127; innovations in (end of Middle Ages), 183; fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, 237-43; eighteenth century, 287-92; centralized in France after Revolution, 316-17; new system of, after French Revolution, 322-3, 327-34; changes in, in France and England, and consequent antagonisms, 332-4; changes in, due to Revolution of 1848, 350-1; nineteenth century, 356-9, 370-3; twentieth century, 375-80; after World War, 400-8
 Political theories (nineteenth century), 343-5, 356, 358, 359-60
 Polybius, 40
 Pope: primacy of, recognized, 59; dignity enhanced, 79; alliance with Frankish kings, 87; affected by disorder of society, 124; authority of, 170-1; proclaimed supreme by Council of Trent, 228
 Population of Europe: in ancient times, 20; in Middle Ages, 135-6, 193-4; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 246, 278; eighteenth century, 298; nineteenth century, 337, 363-4; twentieth century, 387, 416
 Positivism, 368, 396
 Postal service, 249-50, 341
 Poussin, 213
 Premonstratensians, 164
 Presbyterian Church, 236, 258, 264, 268, 270, 288
 Press, freedom of the, 329-30, 350, 373, 407
 Priestley, 306
Prince, The, 245
 Printing, 195
 Privateering, 252, 282
 Proportional representation, 377, 402
 Protestant churches, 218, 219, 221-6; relations with secular authority, 218, 222-6
 Protestant Union, 234, 235
 Punishment, 22, 23, 42, 44, 75-6, 118; "exemplary," 275
 Rabelais, 214
 Race: and language, 13, 396-7; relations between people and, 18-20
 Races of Europe, 8-9
 Racine, 286
 Rambouillet, Marquise de, 262
 Raphael, 213
 Reformation: Protestant, 212, 215-26; Catholic, 226-7, 259
 Reformed Church, 222-3, 224, 232, 273
 Religion: of ancient Europe, 23-4, 25, 50-2; of Greeks, 29, 52; Roman, 52; unity of, established, 60-1; at end of Middle Ages, 208-9; and Renaissance art, 213; increasing freedom of, 285; "natural," 302-6, *and see* Natural religion; practice of, nineteenth century, 343; conflict with science, 368; *and see* Christianity
 Religion, Wars of, 231-4
 Rembrandt, 213
 Renaissance, 211-15; effects of, 215
 Reprisals, 196
 Revolution of 1848, 349-51, 352
 Rhine, Confederation of the, 320
 Richard I, King of England, 129, 130
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 235, 238
Risorgimento, 334
 Robert the Strong, Count, 106
 Rollo, 103
 Roman Catholic Church, 120, 122; Reformation of, 226-7; and wars of religion, 231-4; and politics (nineteenth century), 373; twentieth century, 396; *and see* Christianity, Church
 Roman civilization, 40-1
 Roman Empire: domination of, 37-44; transformation of, 45-77; barbarian invasions of, 46, 63, 65-72; restoration of, 47-9, 88-9; dismembered, 93-5
 Roman law, *see under* Law
 Roman people, formation of, 33
 Romanov, house of, 240
 Ronsard, 214
 Roses, Wars of the, 237, 256
 Rothschild family, 336
 Rousseau, 304-5, 306
 Royal Society, English, 285
 Rubens, 213
 Rudolf II, Emperor, 234
 Rurik, house of, 240
 Russia: unique position of, sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 260-1
 Russo-Japanese War, 380
 Ruysdael, 213

Index

- Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 99
 Saint-Simon, 346
 Salons, 283-4
 Salvation Army, 396
 Saracens, 103-4
 Saxons, 88
 Scandinavian peoples, 111-12; Christianized, 121
 Schiller, 325
 Scholasticism, 176, 209
 Schools: mediæval, 173-6, 209-10; Jesuit, 227, 258-9; convent, 341, 397; specialized, 346-7; *and see* Education, Universities
 Sciences: Greek, 28-9, 30-3, 40; Roman, 40; adopt purely rational method, 262; seventeenth century, 285-6; eighteenth century, 306; after French Revolution, 325; nineteenth century, 346-7, 367-8; twentieth century, 380-1, 382, 394-5, 420
 Sculpture, 33, 210-11, 213, 348, 420
 Sensibility, enthusiasm for, 305
 Serfs, 135, 201, 202, 300; enfranchisement of, in Russia, 354, 364
 Severus, Emperor, 46
 Shakespeare, 214, 263
 Slavery, 27, 36, 69; under Roman Empire, 41, 42, 45, 67; and Christianity, 55, 56; under Germanic peoples, 65; after barbarian invasions, 76, 77; in ninth century, 97; in Middle Ages, 202; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 252, 282
 Slavs, 112-15; invade Roman Empire, 68; Christianized, 121-2
 Social organization: in ancient Europe, 21-3, 25; *and see* Society
 Socialists, 345-6, 347, 350, 352, 373-5, 376, 394, 396, 400, 402, 403-4, 405, 418
 Society: transformation of, under Roman Empire, 41-4; reorganized, 95-7; in early Middle Ages, 132-3; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 255-61, 282-4; eighteenth century, 298-302; nineteenth century, 337-42, 364-7; theories of (nineteenth century), 345-6; twentieth century, 387-90, 416-19
 Socrates, 31, 303
 South Sea Company, 297
 Spain: dismemberment of, 107-8; unified, 178; Constitution of 1812, 321
 Speculation, 297, 363, 366, 411
 Spencer, Herbert, 368
 Sport, 391, 420
Stabat Mater, 176
 Star Chamber, 241
 State: origin of term, 179; separation from Church in France, 376; growth in imperial power of, 377
 States of the Church, 87, 182, 327
 Stephen, King of Hungary, 121
 Stock exchanges, 250, 363
 Stonehenge, 11
 Strasbourg oath, 94
 Strikes, 203, 259, 324, 339, 365, 414
 Stuart, house of, 231, 236, 237, 268-9, 288
 Suffrage, universal, 332, 333, 350, 376, 377, 402, 404-5, 417
 Susa, 10
 Swift, 306
 Swiss Confederation, 177, 178, 179, 238-9
 Tasso, 214
 Taxation: under Late Roman Empire, 49; among barbarians, 117; by landowners, 118; ecclesiastical, 182, 216-17, 242-3; voted by assemblies, 185; new methods of (late Middle Ages), 188-9; system of, strengthened, 242; seventeenth century, 275; eighteenth century, 298, 309, 310; twentieth century, 377, 413
 Taylor system, 386
 Templars, 131
 Tennis Court, Oath of the, 309-10
 Teutonic Order, 131, 177, 178
 Theodoric, 74
 Thirty Years' War, 234-6, 244, 277
 Thomas, Sidney G., 383
 Thomas à Kempis, 208
 Thomas Aquinas, 175, 343
 Tiryns, 11, 26
 Titian, 213
 Totalitarian regime, 406, 407
 Towns: formation of, 147-9; government of, 149-51; inhabitants of, 151-6; transformation of, 156-8; size of, 156; as centres of civilization, 161-3
 Townspeople, in Middle Ages, 202-4
 Trade: in ancient Europe, 24; in ninth century, 97; changes in, in Middle Ages, 158-61; routes, 158, 198, 246-7; organization of, in Middle Ages, 195-6, 198-201; sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, 246-7, 249-52, 278-9; regulated by governments, 252-5, 280-2, 298, 345, 379; eighteenth century, 296-8; nineteenth century, 335-6, 361-3; twentieth century, 379, 383-4, 412-13, 416
 Trade unions, 339, 346, 365, 393-4, 414, 418
 Transport: improved, in nineteenth cen-

Index

- tury, 335, 360, 361; twentieth century, 381, 382, 415
Travel for pleasure, 342, 367
Trent, Council of, 227-9, 232, 259
Triple Alliance, 379, 380, 399
Triple Entente, 380, 399
Troubadours, 162
Troy, 10
Trusts, 385
Turgot, 300

Unemployment, 365, 412, 418, 421-2
Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, 405-6, 413-14
Universities, 157, 174-6, 183, 207, 209, 354, 369, 394
Urban II, Pope, 129-30
Ursulines, 259

Valdo, 168
Vauban, 277
Velásquez, 213
Verdun, Treaty of, 94
Vienna, Congress of, 330, 331
Villon, 210
Virgil, 40
Visitandines, 259
Voltaire, 303, 306
Vulgate, 228

Wages, iron law of, 300
Wagner, 369
Waldenses, 168, 169
Wallenstein, 235
War: in ancient Europe, 25, 32, 138; as practised by Romans, 34-5; among Germanic peoples, 65, 67-8; in Middle Ages, 139, 144, 187-8; in seventeenth century, 276-8; new strategy in, 318-19; twentieth century, 402-3
War of Prussia and Austria against Denmark, 355
Watt, James, 295
Wealth: under Roman Empire, 43, 46-7; increase in, in Middle Ages, 156; of clergy, 165; of nobles, threatened, 255-6, 301, 366; of bourgeois, 258, 366; sought by governments, 200-2; in twentieth century, 388
Wenceslas, Prince, 121
West Indian Company, 252
Westphalia, Congress of, 235, 278
William, Prince of Orange, 232
William I, German Emperor, 355
William II, German Emperor, 379-80
William I, King of England, 127-8, 140
William III, King of England, 267, 269
Witches, persecution of, 216, 261, 284
Woman: under Roman Empire, 42-3; eleventh to thirteenth centuries, 145; seventeenth century, 283-4; nineteenth century, 367; twentieth century, 392-3, 419-20
World War, 370, 399-400; effects of, 401-3
Wycliffe, 209
Wynfrith, 86

Yeomen, 201, 205, 299
Yves, St., 208

Zionism, 397
Zwingli, 218, 219, 220

A NOTE ON THE TYPE IN WHICH THIS BOOK IS SET

This book is composed on the Linotype in Bodoni, so called after Giambattista Bodoni (1740-1813), son of a printer of Piedmont. After gaining experience and fame as superintendent of the Press of the Propaganda in Rome, Bodoni became in 1766 the head of the ducal printing house at Parma, which he soon made the foremost of its kind in Europe. His Manuale Tipografico, completed by his widow in 1818, contains 279 pages of specimens of types, including alphabets of about thirty foreign languages. His editions of Greek, Latin, Italian, and French classics, especially his Homer, are celebrated for their typography. In type-designing he was an innovator, making his new faces rounder, wider, and lighter, with greater openness and delicacy. His types were rather too rigidly perfect in detail, the thick lines contrasting sharply with the thin wiry lines. It was this feature, doubtless, that caused William Morris's condemnation of the Bodoni types as "swelteringly hideous." Bodoni Book, as reproduced by the Linotype Company, is a modern version based, not upon any one of Bodoni's fonts, but upon a composite conception of the Bodoni manner, designed to avoid the details stigmatized as bad by typographical experts and to secure the pleasing and effective results of which the Bodoni types are capable.



THIS BOOK WAS COMPOSED, PRINTED, AND BOUND BY
THE PLIMPTON PRESS, NORWOOD, MASS. THE PAPER
WAS MADE BY S. D. WARREN CO., BOSTON.